

THE  
METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

JULY, 1860.

---

ART I.—MANSEL'S LIMITS OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.

*The Limits of Religious Thought examined; in Eight Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford in the year 1858, on the Bampton Foundation. By HENRY LONGUEVILLE MANSEL, B.D. 1 vol., 12mo. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.*

PERHAPS few volumes have issued from the teeming press of America or Europe, during the past two years, that have combined in themselves so many elements calculated to awaken thought and stimulate investigation as the one now before us. Apart from the fact that it deals with a subject of vital interest to humanity, it has sprung, like a Minerva full-armed, into the very midst of "the battle of the evidences," at an era when an amount of thought and research unparalleled in any past age is being applied to the problems that connect themselves either directly or indirectly with the Bible as a divine revelation. Superadded to this, however, it possesses an interest peculiar to itself, growing out of the fact that it may justly be considered the first authoritative application of the celebrated "Philosophy of the Conditioned to the problems of theology;" and we can but regard it as singularly appropriate that this work should have been undertaken by Mr. Mansel, who (as is well known) was a favorite disciple of Sir William Hamilton, and who has since been selected as one of the associated editors of his posthumous works. It was therefore with no ordinary degree of interest that we entered upon an examination of it, feeling assured that the known character and antecedents of its author are a sufficient guarantee that no injustice has been done to the system in subjecting it to the test of a practical application, either through misconception of its principles or incapacity to apply them properly. And while we must dissent, for

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XII.—23

reasons which will appear in the sequel, from the conclusions to which its distinguished author comes, we cheerfully bear testimony to the manly honesty, the profound learning, and the earnest devotion to the cause of truth everywhere apparent in its pages, to a brief survey of which we now invite the thoughtful reader.

It starts out, in opposition to Rationalism on the one hand and to Dogmatism on the other, with the fundamental postulate: "That the primary and proper object of criticism is not *religion*, natural or revealed, but the human mind in its relation to religion." (P. 61.) For a direct criticism of religion as a representation of God can only be accomplished by the construction of a philosophy of the infinite; but such a philosophy is essentially impossible to man, because the infinite and absolute, as such, are essentially incognizable and inconceivable. Incognizable, because they can be known neither immediately as unconditioned, nor yet mediately through the finite. Inconceivable, because consciousness is possible only under the conditions of relation, limitation, and personality; but to predicate any one or all of them, of the infinite and absolute, were to destroy them in the attempt to conceive them. Nevertheless, as necessary negative notions, they do and must exist as part of the furniture of the mind; possessing, it is true, no positive value, since they do not represent reality; but invaluable "as regulative ideas of the Deity, which are sufficient to guide our practice, even if they do not satisfy our intellects." (P. 131.) Every attempt therefore to reason concerning them must needs terminate in a maze of self-contradictions and absurdities, and this result is equally inevitable whether we confine our researches to the domain of abstract science and metaphysics, or whether we seek, by the aid of revelation, to know and conceive God as the self-existent, immutable, and infinite Creator and moral Governor of the universe. It is to no purpose then that the Rationalist or skeptic pleads the incomprehensible or seemingly self-contradictory nature of certain doctrines of revelation as an objection to their truth, since the objection would lie with equal force against science or metaphysics; these self-contradictions inhering in the limitations of the finite reason and not in the essential nature of things. The possibility or impossibility of conception cannot therefore be assumed to be identical with the possibility or impossibility of existence; and revelation must not be judged in virtue of the presence or absence of the incomprehensible and self-contradictory, but of the strength or weakness of the external evidence by which its claims are supported.

Such, in brief, is the plausible and skillfully developed theory which Mr. Mansel has presented, by which he claims to have utterly



invalidated the attacks alike of the Rationalist and the skeptic, by removing the whole controversy from the plane of reason to that of a transcendental faith, thus resting the issue upon the strength of the positive evidences for and against the genuineness and authenticity of the Scriptures as a divine revelation. The only pertinent question is, therefore, are his premises valid, and his conclusions legitimate?

His initial postulate, "That the true object of criticism is not religion, but the limits of religious thought," suggests two important queries, namely: 1. How shall the limits of thought be determined? and, 2. What is the legitimate corollary that must be drawn from the nature of those limits as thus determined? How our author has solved these problems the sequel will more fully show; meanwhile he shall speak for himself:

"We can adequately criticise that only which we know as a whole. The objects of natural religion are known to us in and by those ideas which we can form of them; and these ideas do not of themselves constitute a whole apart from the remaining phenomena of consciousness. We must not examine them by themselves alone; we must look to their origin, their import, and their relation to the mind of which they are a part. Revealed religion, again, is not by itself a direct object of criticism: first, because it is but part of a larger scheme, and that scheme one imperfectly comprehended; and, secondly, because revelation implies an accommodation to the mental constitution of its human receivers, and we must know what that constitution is before we can pronounce how far the accommodation extends."—P. 60.

Now all this, at a cursory glance, appears very reasonable; yet it obviously involves two difficulties, namely: First, That on these conditions any criticism whatever of religion or science as such is a simple impossibility. If we may only criticise that which we *know adequately*, not merely in itself, but *in all its relations*, we cannot criticise anything—the schoolboy's essay, the Principia of Newton, and the revealed word of God equally escape us.

Secondly, Conjoining to it a subsequent statement of Mr. Mansel's, we find ourselves involved in the meshes of the absurd corollary, that no degree of self-contradiction, however great, nor any absurdity, however apparent, can justify us in rejecting any pretended revelation whatever. Logically, therefore, the Vedas, the Koran, the Bible, and the Book of Mormon, so far as internal evidence is concerned, must be recognized as having equal claims upon our faith, and must therefore be accepted or rejected solely on the ground of the inherent strength or weakness of the external evidence by which they are severally supported. To such a conclusion we must demur. As a rule of action it would be insufferably tedious and unsatisfactory, shutting the door at once and forever upon

all *a priori* reasoning, and condemning us to the endless labor of examining into the external or material evidences, not merely of every pretended revelation, but also of every fancied discovery in the arts or sciences, no matter how puerile or absurd. Yet from such a conclusion Mr. Mansel cannot escape after having propounded the twin dicta: first, That no criticism is legitimate in the absence of a complete knowledge of the *subject, per se, of its origin, its import, and its relations*. And, secondly, that neither *relative* nor *self-contradictions* can authorize us, *a priori*, to reject any doctrine whatever. Nor are these incidental expressions; they are dogmas which he not only iterates and reiterates, but which he himself applies practically: first, by proving that all conceptions of God as absolute and infinite (forms, be it remembered, under which he testifies that we must necessarily conceive Deity if we conceive him at all) are *mutually* as well as *self-contradictory*; and secondly, by attempting to fasten upon us this bundle of contradictions as the only proper object of faith. But if we may, nay, must believe one pair of contradictions, by what warrant shall we reject any other?

Such a definition of criticism not only effectually destroys it as an agent of human progress, but supersedes the necessity for its use where it is possible. The very act of criticism involves the idea of an attempt to reach truth by progressive approach, and it may therefore be successfully applied by the unskilled to the works or theories of the adept. But on Mr. Mansel's hypothesis it were not merely presumptuous, it were absurd for one possessing anything less comprehensive than omniscient wisdom to attempt to criticise any book whatever, however crude its statements or absurd its conclusions; and to one possessing such wisdom criticism were puerile, and direct revelation alone appropriate.

But if our author's definition of criticism is self-destructive, is his dialectic application of it, in his attempt to determine the limits of religious thought, more fortunate? Here, contrary to what might rationally have been anticipated, he seeks to solve the problem by applying the powers of reason directly to the solution of the very questions of theology in reference to which he desires to ascertain their scope. This, of course, necessitated the adoption of some *a priori* standard of criticism, in conformity to which the results of each successive application might be determined. This touchstone Mr. Mansel finds in the principle of contradiction. Every conception or notion, therefore, which in its logical development ultimates in contradictions, is declared to be incogitable and inconceivable, to transcend the limits of thought, and to have place only in the shadowy realms of faith. Thus our notions of the absolute and

infinite, when rationally developed, are found to be mutually as well as self-contradictory, and hence must be classed, not with the positive conceptions of the real, but with mere negative notions that have no other significance or guaranty than our mental impotence can give them. But if this dogma is valid at all, it must ultimate logically in the general axiom, *That every idea which, either in itself, its origin, its relations, or its results, involves the incomprehensible or the contradictory is incognizable, and must therefore be excluded from the domain of legitimate thought.* But on such an hypothesis it is obvious that the finite as well as the infinite must be transferred to the category of the unthinkable; that mathematics is as incogitable and self-contradictory as theology can possibly be. If such a conclusion is deemed inadmissible, no alternative remains but to retrace our steps, discard this initial hypothesis, and thus absolve ourselves from the fatal conclusions to which it inevitably leads. Any attempt, therefore, by its aid to draw a line of demarcation between the realms of thought and of faith, or to identify cognition or knowledge with conception, and to predicate faith exclusively of the incognizable and the inconceivable, is as futile as it is absurd. One of two conclusions were inevitable. Either faith itself must become a delusion, as the infidel asserts it to be, or its rationality must be assumed to be in direct proportion to the number and degree of the self-contradictions inhering in its object.

Lest we be suspected of caricaturing Mr. Mansel, we waive farther discussion of this topic and hasten to a formal examination of his second fundamental postulate, namely: "That all notions of the absolute, the infinite, of a first cause, etc., lie beyond the limits of legitimate thought." Space will not permit us to enter at length into the metaphysical discussion involved necessarily in any issue taken upon this point; in fact, such an issue were far more pertinent to a review of Sir William Hamilton's *Philosophy of the Conditioned* than to the volume before us. Necessity, however, compels us to notice some of its more salient features, and to indicate what seems to us to be the source of its inherent fallacies. The theory itself is based essentially upon the formulas of logic, and possesses therefore a dialectical rather than a psychologic character. It begins by reducing all our notions to two categories, namely, the conditioned and the unconditioned, (or, popularly, the finite and the infinite;) the latter, in turn, it subdivides into the unconditionally unlimited or infinite, and the unconditionally limited or absolute— notions radically contradictory of each other. Of the three notions the first alone, that is, the conditionally limited, or finite, is a subject of consciousness; that is, is cognizable and conceivable, because

it alone can be known under the conditions of limitation, difference, and relation which are affirmed, *a priori*, to be the conditions of all consciousness whatever. To limit the infinite or absolute as such were to destroy them in the attempt to conceive them; hence they are not real positive conceptions, conformed to reality, but mere negations of the finite. But in virtue of the dialectical law, "that of two contradictories both cannot be true nor both false at the same time," we are logically necessitated to believe in the existence of the one or the other extreme. But we must not mistake this formal faith for a demonstration, real though negative, of the actual existence of either. They are nothing more than necessary correlates of human thought, the imaginary poles between which it oscillates without ever attaining to either. It is true that both Sir William Hamilton and Mr. Mansel have assumed that these mutually contradictory notions represent a real though, to us, an incognizable and inconceivable existence, the unknown god of Athenian polytheism, the Jehovah of Christian monotheism; but this assumption is not only wholly unwarranted, but it is inconsistent with their own positive enunciations elsewhere made. Both agree that the absolute and infinite, when viewed apart, are found to be severally self-contradictory, just as they are mutually destructive when considered in relation to each other or to the finite. But here again our author shall speak for himself:

"The conceptions of the absolute and infinite, from whatever side we view it, appears encompassed with contradictions. There is a contradiction in supposing such an object to exist, whether alone or in conjunction with others; and there is a contradiction in supposing it not to exist. There is a contradiction in conceiving it as one, and there is a contradiction in conceiving it as many. There is a contradiction in conceiving it as personal, and there is a contradiction in conceiving it as impersonal. It cannot without contradiction be represented as active, nor without equal contradiction be represented as inactive. It cannot be conceived as the sum of all existence, nor yet can it be conceived as part only of that sum."—P. 84.

Surely, amid such a mass of incurable contradictions, the thought must sometimes have occurred to the distinguished author of this system of philosophy, that there must be some concealed fallacy in the logical premises upon which his theories are based. It were useless for him to retort "that similar contradictions environ all rival systems;" for were the allegation admitted it would not relieve his difficulties, much less could it justify his utterly inconsequent attempt to postulate a necessary faith in these self-contradictory negations as a normal law of our intellectual being. It were far more rational to reject his definitions of the absolute and infinite as being purely imaginary, and thus, by abolishing the poles of his

paradoxical antithesis, absolve ourselves from the logical necessity of believing such a mass of absurdities.

Followed out to its legitimate conclusions, the system must ultimately in complete atheism, notwithstanding the fact that it claims and is reputed to be, pre-eminently, the Christian philosophy. For:

1. It limits the domain of valid thought strictly to the finite, affirming that we can neither cognize nor conceive anything that transcends the sphere of the relative, the limited, the determined.

2. It declares all notions of the infinite, the absolute, and of a first cause to be, not positive conceptions *based upon the necessity of things per se*, but mere negations of the finite, self-contradictory and mutually destructive, *based on mental impotence*.

3. Therefore it necessarily excludes all that is cogitable (or thinkable) from our representations of God, affirming him to be at once incognizable and inconceivable; or in other words, it declares him to be essentially an *unknown God*, to worship whom were not less idolatrous than absurd.

Permit us to illustrate. Either wisdom, justice, goodness, and truth, which both reason and revelation predicate of Deity as his essential attributes, are conceivable or they are inconceivable. If conceivable, they pertain to the finite, and cannot rationally be predicated of the infinite; if they are themselves inconceivable, they cannot be to us a revelation of anything, for the unknown cannot reveal the unknown. In a word, on the basis of the Hamiltonian philosophy, God, as absolute, infinite, or first cause, is essentially incognizable and inconceivable, and can be represented to us neither by the finite nor the infinite. The former cannot represent the latter by similarity, for it has and can have nothing in common with it; nor yet by contrariety, for the infinite, as absolute, excludes all contrariety. Hence God is to man as if he were not; rationally we can neither affirm his existence nor predicate of him any attribute whatever; nay, more, revelation itself becomes an impossibility and a dream.

The same conclusion may be reached as directly by another route equally convincing, namely, either our negative conception of the absolute and infinite (or of God, if the reader prefer) are conformed to reality or they are not. If they are conformed to reality, then, *pro tanto*, we do cognize and conceive the absolute and infinite; if they are not conformed to reality, God escapes us wholly, and blank atheism is the hopeless result. It is utterly in vain, at this juncture, that Mr. Mansel tells us that atheism involves contradictions equally hopeless. Grant it, and what then? Either *mutual* and *self-contradictions* are or they are not a sufficient ground for the rejection of any notion or hypothesis whatever; if they are, all

such must go by the board together; if they are not, the law of contradiction and the excluded middle, upon which Sir William Hamilton bases his excision of such notions as incogitable, is valueless in psychology. Either alternative is fatal. For ourselves we choose an easier path, and demur outright against a theory which would force us upon the horns of such a dilemma. Will it be objected that we must accept some one of the systems offered, or propound a better? We reply that we acknowledge no such necessity, but prefer, if we must, to follow the example of the South Sea Islanders—*burn our idols* and wait patiently for a God.

But our readers may be curious to know how our author avoids these logical but self-destructive results of the premises which he has so confidently propounded. Here again he shall speak for himself:

"On the one hand it must be allowed that it is not through reasoning that men obtain the first intimation of their relation to Deity, and that, had they been left to the guidance of their intellectual faculties alone, it is possible that no such intimation might have taken place; or, at best, it would have been but as one guess out of many equally plausible and equally natural.\* Those who lay exclusive stress on the proof of the existence of God from the marks of design in the world, or from the necessity of supposing a first cause of all phenomena, overlook the fact that man learns to pray before he learns to reason; that he feels within him the consciousness of a Supreme Being and the instinct of worship before he can argue from effects to causes, or estimate the traces of wisdom and benevolence scattered through the creation. . . . We may therefore, without hesitation, accede to the argument of the great critic of metaphysics when he tells us that the speculative reason is unable to prove the existence of a Supreme Being, but can only correct our conception of such a Being, supposing it already obtained."—Pp. 115, 116.

Again he says:

"Religious thought, if it is to exist at all, can only exist as representative of some fact of religious intuition, of some individual state of mind, in which is presented, as an immediate fact, that relation of man to God of which man by reflection may become distinctly and definitely conscious. Two such states may be specified as dividing between them the rude material out of which reflection builds up the edifice of religious consciousness. These are the *feelings of dependence* and the *conviction of moral obligation*."—P. 119.

The one gives us as a fundamental principle, the *fear of God*; the other carries with it the *conviction of sin*. But these, either separately or conjoined, as Mr. Mansel admits, can only give us the conception of a God *finite* like ourselves; logically, therefore, it can serve only as the basis for the conception of an anthropomorphic deity, adequate indeed to the wants of a refined Grecian polytheism, but not to those of a Christian monotheism; it may suffice to people a

\* He should have said, equally contradictory and absurd.—REV.



Greek Olympus, but not to reveal Him who dwelleth in immensity. This difficulty Mr. Mansel attempts to meet thus, namely:

"Though our positive religious consciousness is of the *finite only*, there yet runs through the whole of that consciousness the accompanying conviction that the infinite does exist and must exist. . . . We cannot be conscious of the infinite, but we can be and are conscious of the limits of our own powers of thought; and therefore we know that the possibility or impossibility of conception is no test of the possibility or impossibility of existence. We know that unless we admit the existence of the infinite, the existence of the finite is inexplicable and self-contradictory; and yet we know that the conception of the infinite itself appears to involve contradictions *no less inexplicable*. In this impotence of reason we are compelled to take refuge in faith, and to believe that an infinite Being exists, though we know not how, and that he is the same Being who is made known in our consciousness as our sustainer and lawgiver."—P. 127.

But wherefore? Why take refuge in faith rather than in atheism? Why superadd to the necessary contradictions involved in the conception of the finite two new classes of contradictions, namely, "the *no less inexplicable* contradiction" inhering in the idea of the infinite, and the conjoined impossibility of conceiving the co-existence of the finite and the infinite? True, our author says, "that unless we admit the existence of the infinite, the existence of the finite is inexplicable;" but it is *not less so* after such an admission, which is therefore at once *irrational* and *futile*.

Again, he says in the same paragraph, as already quoted: "We know that the possibility or impossibility of conception is no test of the possibility or impossibility of existence;" but may not the atheist retort with crushing power: "True, we cannot conceive the finite as self-existent, 'but we know that the possibility or impossibility of conception is no test of the possibility of existence;' therefore the finite may in reality be self-existent." Such a reply would, on the basis of the "Philosophy of the Conditioned," be entirely unanswerable. Nor should such a result be a matter of surprise when we reflect that for that philosophy there is no escape from the fatal circle of the hopelessly subjective. Practically, therefore, it ultimates in the same conclusions with the Positivism of M. Comte, although it starts seemingly from different premises and travels a diverse road. Both begin and end with the phenomenal, with this simple variation: that the one (Positivism) is based upon the fundamental postulate that to man the phenomenal alone is real, enunciated in M. Comte's celebrated "Law of Evolution," namely: "That the human mind by its nature employs in its progress three methods of philosophizing, the character of which is essentially different and even radically opposed, namely, the theological, or fictitious; the metaphysical, or abstract; and the scientific, or positive; each of

which excludes the other. The first is the necessary point of departure of the human understanding, and the third is its fixed and definite state; the second is merely a state of transition." The other, that is, the Philosophy of the Conditioned, begins with the correlate axiom, that the phenomenal alone is cognizable and conceivable. Both postulate the immediacy and reality of perception as a necessary truth, and both exclude the infinite and the absolute from the sphere of the cogitable or thinkable, and on almost identical grounds. But here, somewhat strangely, their paths diverge. M. Comte, consistently, we must think, excises and outlaws these *negative notions* as at once self-contradictory and mutually destructive; while Sir William Hamilton, ascribing to them identically the same character, challenges for them (so far as we can see) without reason a necessary faith. Paradoxical, therefore, as it may be deemed, we hazard the assertion that the French infidel could have based his rejection of theology more securely upon the foundation laid by his Scotch compeer than upon that which he has himself laid.

It is almost superfluous for us to add, that, if our preceding criticisms are just, Mr. Mansel's so called *Regulative Truths* are utterly worthless; that any consistent theory which denies to them a speculative value must go farther and discard them altogether, or, at best, retain them and ascribe to them no other office or potency than the astronomer ascribes to the imaginary lines by whose aid he maps out the starry heavens. Legitimately, Mr. Mansel may use them as the formal poles of thought; but the moment he attempts to postulate them as objects of faith, he is guilty of the grossest inconsistency.

There is yet one other aspect of this singular theory that deserves a more extended notice than it has yet received, inasmuch as it exhibits with peculiar force its inherent weakness. If we recur to its fundamental postulate, namely, "That the absolute and infinite as such are incognizable and inconceivable," and conjoin to it a declaration elsewhere made, namely, "That to conceive Deity *as he is*, we must conceive him as first cause, as absolute, and as infinite," we find ourselves planted on the horns of this singular dilemma: Given a being absolute and infinite, *per se*, it is required to reveal him, his existence and attributes, to a race of beings who are incapable of cognizing or conceiving anything but the finite, the relative, the determined. If God be revealed at all, he must be revealed as *he is* and *not as he is not*. But our author has iterated and reiterated that the finite *cannot in whole or in part* represent the infinite; while the latter as such cannot be cognized. It follows, therefore,

that a revelation of God to man is an utter impossibility, since he can neither be revealed by the finite nor the infinite, neither by unity nor diversity. It is but just to say, however, that he has endeavored to break the force of this objection; but how?

"It has been objected, (says he,) by reviewers of very opposite schools, that to deny to man a knowledge of the infinite is to make revelation itself impossible. The objection would be pertinent if I had ever maintained that revelation is or can be a direct manifestation of the infinite nature of God. But I have constantly asserted the very reverse. In revelation, as in natural religion, God is represented under *finite* conceptions adapted to finite minds."—P. 22.

The obvious failure of this reply is conclusive proof that the objection is fatal. It is no sort of answer that he (Mr. M.) "never maintained that revelation is or can be a direct manifestation of the infinite nature of God;" for a revelation must be a manifestation (direct or indirect) of God *as he is*, that is, as *infinite*; but that which represents him under finite conceptions represents him *as he is not*, and demonstrably, therefore, is a *false* revelation. He, therefore, who worships a God thus represented worships that which has no existence, and is therefore an idolater, a conclusion from which there is no escape. Mr. Mansel then being witness, God has given us a revelation of himself which is demonstrably false; but which he nevertheless requires us at the peril of our soul's salvation to believe not only to be true, but to be, par excellence, *the truth*. Instead, therefore, of having harmonized reason and faith by determining their several limits, our author has reduced them to a condition of irremediable hostility—a conclusion more self-contradictory and absurd than any to which a philosophy of the infinite could possibly lead us. We frankly confess that for ourselves personally, in preference to such a theory, we would embrace pantheism and sink the personality of Jehovah in the unconscious ocean of being, or join the atheist in the declaration that "there is no God."

We cannot, perhaps, better express the disappointment we have felt in tracing the development of our author's ingenious but erratic theory than by comparing it to that which I have sometimes imagined must have filled the breast of an old monotheistic Arabian patriarch if, attracted by rumors of the wondrous manifestations of the divine presence and power in Egypt, at the Red Sea, and in the desert, he had chanced to approach the foot of Sinai on the fatal morning when Aaron reared his golden idol, and hearing the herald's proclamation: "These be thy gods, O Israel, which have brought thee up out of the land of Egypt," had hurried forward with eagerness, expecting to behold the Divine shekinah, and found only a

golden calf. There at least was a tangible image, upon which, if deftly wrought in polished gold, the eye might rest with pleasure as upon a beautiful work of art; albeit faith might, nay, must sink in utter death. But in the adytum of the sanctuary into which Mr. Mansel has invited us, we beheld not, as we had hoped, the symbols of a purer, higher, and more intelligent faith in the God of nature and revelation, but, on the contrary, were met with the chilling dogma, "That the revelations we do possess are *not* representations, true but inadequate, of the infinite Jehovah, but, on the contrary, mere illusions, representing nothing real, and serving no higher purpose than the nurse's fairy tale, with which she is wont to charm or terrify the wayward child.

It is with sincere regret that we thus characterize our impressions of a work that displays so much earnestness, ability, and devotion to the cause of Christ. But believing, as we do, that there is no source of danger to that cause more real than the ill-judged efforts of its enthusiastic friends, we could not reconcile it with a sense of duty to permit errors so dangerous to be disseminated as the teachings of a pre-eminently Christian philosophy without at least entering a protest against them. Christianity needs no such defense, and we have an abiding faith that she can live and triumph *with* or *without* the aid of metaphysics; and therefore she has everything to lose and nothing to gain by allying herself with any system, however plausible or popular, which silently but effectually undermines the fundamental conceptions upon which theology rests.

---

#### ART. II.—LIFE OF PLATO.

THE desire to know something of the person and habits of great men is not only an innocent curiosity, deserving to be gratified for its own sake, but it may be appropriated and turned to good account by the *scientific spirit*. The public life of a hero or statesman is better understood from an acquaintance with his private life and personal peculiarities. How these several particulars coalesce into unity is strikingly evinced in Napoleon and in Cicero. The influence and doctrine of a philosopher, likewise, may be the more thoroughly comprehended if we have command of the facts relating to his education, his manners, and his associations. Every fact pertaining to thing or person is part of the whole which we desire to understand, and has relations of antecedence and consequence, of

likeness and unlikeness to the remaining parts. As every manifestation of *electric action*, for example, leads to an understanding of the laws of electricity, and every *new* phenomenon is either referred to pre-established laws or directs us toward the discovery of new laws; so, in a man's life, every word and every act may either add confirmation to what we already know of him, or develop a new phase of character, a new habit and tendency. Now, while a close and careful study of life and character is what most men do not deserve at our hands, it is an *imperative duty* devolved on us by the Providence acting through those whom we call *great* men. What makes a man *great* is the fact that he *generates*, or in an eminent degree *sustains* and *carries on* the leading tendencies of human life in the age in which he lives. Since, therefore, we regard history as *the manifestation* of Divine Providence in our race, every great man becomes in our eyes an important minister of that presiding power, collecting in himself the momenta of the past, and foreshadowing the aims of the future.

Upon the intellectual life of our race no man has exerted a wider and more lasting influence than Plato, the Athenian. To this day he divides the empire of philosophy with his profoundest pupil, Aristotle, and there is no probability that future ages will dispute the place of either. The universe which man contemplates divides itself into an inner and an outer world—a material and a spiritual—a domain of thought and a realm of experience. Accordingly, all philosophizing, as it gives prominence to the inner or the outer, will take the type of *idealism* or *sensualism*, using these terms in a broad sense. Of these types the latter is represented by Aristotle, the former by Plato.

Had Plato been an ordinary mind he could not in his era have conceived the great problem of a philosophy of reason, much less have grasped it with such comprehension of its method and aim as to have propounded the questions, and marked out the way to their solution, which must occupy the speculative faculty of man to the remotest ages. Doubtless he was much indebted for the direction of his thoughts to his predecessors, and particularly to Socrates. But his superiority is discoverable in the fact that he was the only one of the followers of that divine man who had the speculative ability to seize the problems he proposed and develop his suggestions into a system.

The time has long since passed when inquiring minds could receive the dicta of either Plato or Aristotle as beyond appeal. The worship once paid them has forever ceased. To the many-sided thought of our age, both their results and their method are open to

much criticism. Ours is an age when reason, drilled to methods forced upon it by the uncompromising processes of nature, and absolved from bondage to imagination and prejudice, is prepared to consider attentively all phenomena, and to seek in all varieties of facts the prevalence of *law*. Furnished as we are with wondrous discoveries and with well-digested sciences which enable us to discover many errors in the efforts of ancient inquirers after truth, we are at the same time so much the better qualified to appreciate what our predecessors have done, and to value the legacy of their speculations, without which, as forerunners, our science could not have arisen. To us, therefore, in the glory of our acquisitions, Plato is part of a vast system of intellectual development which is still in progress, and his influence is still as vital, though not as dominant, as ever.

We have said thus much, not to give promise of a critique on the philosophy of Plato, but to justify the interest we feel in the study of his life and character. And if any, however few, should be led by this essay to an earnest study of the writings of the great philosopher, we should think it a great gain, and rejoice in the work of our hands, though we might not anticipate that any such student would acquire the *matter of truth* so much as that *discipline of mind* which, as a *vis medicatrix*, will make him sound for the reception, digestion, and handling of truth.

In collecting material for this paper we have not only consulted Olympiodorus, Diogenes Laërtius, and the scattered notices in Plato's collective works, but have made free use of the Platonic epistles, with the exception of the thirteenth. We have not lost sight of the fact that the greater number of modern scholars either doubt or deny the genuineness of these epistles; but we have also borne in mind that the ablest scholars, while doubting their genuineness, admit them to be trustworthy as to the facts. They were regarded as genuine, however, by the ancient critics without exception; and their uniform recognition by the Alexandrian school must be received as a testimony almost decisive. Among modern critics, Bentley, and among living scholars, Mr. Grote, affirm their genuineness. German critics are on the other side. The decision, if made at all, must be made between the authority of the Alexandrian critics on the one hand and the historical criticism of modern German scholars on the other. When we consider the subjective character of German historical criticism, and the rigor with which it pushes *a priori* assumptions to extreme results, we may wisely hesitate to follow their lead. It is said the matter is often trivial, and the style is unworthy of Plato. It may well be admitted that some trivial matter is found,



and that the style is not to be compared with that inimitable style which characterizes the dialogues. But it behooves us to inquire whether this admission compels us to conclude that the author of the epistles could not have been the same with that of the dialogues. Does experience authorize us to expect the same power and skill of any writer in two diverse kinds of composition? If, moreover, it appears that he has employed himself laboriously and ambitiously in the one, but casually and indifferently in the other, should we not expect striking diversities of execution? Again, does not experience teach that *age* has something to do with the vivacity and power of a man's written productions? that he who in his prime could distance all competitors is only to be tolerated, not admired, when senility has enfeebled his thoughts? These suggestions are applicable to the case in hand; for we know, according to a statement of Themistius, that when Plato delivered a lecture on "The Good," in the Peiræus, his audience left him; a fact which indicates, as we think, that, from want of practice, Plato was not master of the style of direct address. We know, again, from Epistle VII, that he was much advanced in age at the time of writing the most important of the epistles. There can, therefore, be no incongruity in ascribing the epistles to him, however displeased we may be at the thought of associating inferior compositions with so illustrious a name. Finally, whatever the merits of the argument, we are safe as to the facts.

Plato was son of Ariston and Perictione, and named from his paternal grandfather, Aristocles. His lineage was noble by both the father's and the mother's side. His mother, according to Diogenes, was daughter of Glaucon, son of Calæschrus, son of Critias, son of Dropides, who was brother of Solon. Plato was therefore sixth from Solon's brother. Critias, one of the thirty, was Perictione's uncle. Ariston's family were traced to the royal Codrus. Plato shares with some other worthies of antiquity the mythological glory of a divine original. Apollo is said to have appeared to his mother and become the author of his existence, meanwhile warning Ariston not to cohabit until after the birth of the child. One could suspect such a fiction to have originated in later times, when Christianity was contending with Platonism for supremacy in the intellectual world, and when adherents of the philosopher would be induced to draw on their imagination for such conceptions of their master as would serve to place him on a seeming level with the divine founder of the Christian system. But the story is found in writers earlier than the Christian era, and is therefore only an instance of the love of the marvelous inherent in our nature, of

which there are so many instances, particularly in antiquity, and which, in this case, found a point of departure in the fact that Plato's birthday, 7th of first month Thargelion, was the same as that assigned to the glorious son of Leto. A more pleasing fancy, illustrating the same tendency to account for the marvelous qualities of a great man by reference to some divine agency or indication, is found in the legend that his parents went in his infancy to Hymettus, a locality famed for bees and honey, to offer sacrifice in behalf of their child; and that while the child lay sleeping the bees filled his mouth with honeycomb, as Olympiodorus says: "Ἴνα ἀληθῆς περὶ αὐτῶν γένηται, τὸν καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέεν αὐδῇ."

Whether he was born at Athens, that is, at Colonus, a suburb of Athens, where his father lived at one time, or at Ægina, whither, according to one account, his father removed just before his birth, cannot be determined. Neither can the year of his birth be made out with perfect certainty, though there is but little reason to differ from those who fix it in the last year of the 87th, or the first of the 88th Olympiad, that is, in 429 or 428 B.C. His father gave him all the facilities for education that were accessible to the youth of Athens. Athenian education consisted of three parts: Letters, *γράμματα*; Music, *μουσική*; and Gymnastics, *γυμναστική*. The first comprised the elementary knowledge requisite to an accurate use of the Attic tongue. The second included all other knowledge of a higher order, supposed to be under the patronage of the Muses, such as poetry, geometry, astronomy. Gymnastics was a purely physical training, and thought to be equally necessary with the other parts of education, the Greeks being adherents of the doctrine, *Mens sana in sano corpore*. No other people known to history have had so nice an appreciation of a perfect bodily development, and none have so mercilessly laughed at or despised physical deformity. Plato's teachers in the several departments are named, and Alcibiades is said to have been a fellow-pupil. He gave proof of his success in gymnastic culture in public contests, once at the Isthmian and once at the Pythian games. •

His youth was spent in the diligent acquisition of knowledge, and his rare imagination bloomed with a glowing promise. He sought intercourse with the painters, and learned how to mix colors. He received instruction from the writers of tragedy, and was familiar at an early age with the aims and precepts of their art. His youth was cotemporary with the old age of Sophocles, and with the mature vigor of Euripides and Aristophanes. A soul so ardent and imaginative as his, at such a period in the history of such a people, could not but flame out in poetic aspirations and attune itself to

poetic harmonies. Accordingly, it is said that Plato, while yet in his teens, composed heroic and dithyrambic verse, and had even prepared himself, at the age of twenty, for a public contest in tragedy at the great festival of Dionysus. None of his poems remain, for he destroyed them. But that he had the fire and the loftiness of a true poet none can doubt who follow him in the sublime flights of the *Phædrus*. He had great relish of Aristophanes and Sophron, and is said to have been the first to bring the books of the latter to Athens. This fondness continued through life, and the books of these poets were found in his death-bed. He is said to have composed an epigram on Aristophanes thus: "The Graces, seeking an imperishable shrine, found it in the soul of Aristophanes."

We have said that Plato destroyed his poems. There is no evidence and no antecedent probability that this was for want of encouragement or prospect of success. On the other hand, his after development, together with his extensive acquaintance with the existing culture of Athens, justifies the supposition that his verse, of whatever kind, must have been far superior to that of most poetic natures at the same period of life. But the fact of destroying his youthful poetic effusions, when he saw before him an opening into a loftier march of intellectual pursuit, is, on the other hand, proof of an exalted nature, of a high moral purpose, as well as keen foresight. The reason why many versifiers of our day do not follow the example is probably the want of so good a mind or so strict a conscience as fell to the lot of the Athenian.

But what particular occasion had Plato for burning his writings? This question is briefly answered. Athens then knew and owned a man who, next to our Lord Jesus Christ, awakens the admiration and love, the veneration and homage of an ingenuous intellect, even now, after centuries have passed and a light so much more glorious than that of philosophy shines upon the soul of man. Socrates, the bald-headed, bare-footed, pug-nosed, Silenus-eyed man, walking and talking, in the shops and in the Agora, from morn to night; Socrates, the wisest if not best in more than five thousand years of the world's history, was then stirring up that intellectual city with his divine thoughts. The youthful Plato, having now reached the age of twenty, heard the wonderful man, and the charms of poetry vanished before the superior attractions of philosophy. It is not an idle pleasure to recall the oft-repeated story how Socrates dreamed that a wingless swan settled on his knee, and presently assuming wings, flew heavenward, and uttered in its flight such notes as entranced the listeners below. Next day, when Πλάτων, the "broad-browed," came to his presence, said Socrates, "This is the swan."

Now, inasmuch as a truly noble nature will be noble even in its smallest deeds, even so we find the largeness of Plato's soul and the activity of his imagination converting the destruction of his parchments into a piece of true poetry, (for true poetry is life idealized.) Going to the temple of Dionysus, he applies the flame, saying:

Ἥφαιστε, πρόμολ' ὦδε  
Πλάτων νύτι σέιο χατίζει.

Haste thee hither, kindly Vulcan,  
Needs thee now the suppliant Platon.

Under the influence of Socrates he began a rapid development, in which the glow of youthful fancy imparted to the stern features of philosophic thought a peculiar charm of mildness and winsomeness. It is not quite certain, but sufficiently probable, that the *Lysis* and the *Phædrus* were composed during the lifetime of Socrates, and therefore between the years 408 and 399 B.C., which latter is the year of the death of Socrates. Tradition is quite uniform as to the composition of these dialogues at this period. The only reason of doubt concerns the *Phædrus*, and is found in the maturity and elaborateness of the thought in the latter part of that treatise, which is supposed to have been beyond the powers of even Plato at that early period of his life. Admitting this, it is competent to conjecture that the latter part of the *Phædrus* is of later date than the former, a conjecture confirmed by several phenomena discoverable in the structure of the dialogue. During the eight or nine years of his intercourse with Socrates, we may assure ourselves he was sufficiently busy in thinking and composing. The activity of his mind is attested by the statement that his multitudinous questions stretched to the utmost even the powers of Socrates in the attempt to answer them. His compositions were submitted to his venerated teacher, and are said to have elicited comments capable of an interpretation not entirely favorable to Plato's fidelity. At this early period, as always afterward, Socrates was a chief interlocutor in the dialogue. Now it is reported by Diogenes that when the *Lysis* was read to him, Socrates remarked to his then present friends: "Mehercle, how many things does the young man falsely report of me." This the enemies of Plato were very willing to construe as a condemnation of his pretension to represent the opinions of Socrates. But what appears to be another version of the same matter is found in an anonymous biography of Plato, as follows: "This young man leads me whither he will, and as far as he pleases, and to whatever he wills." It is probably an instance of mere pleasantry, the wise and good-natured Socrates intending by it indirectly to commend

rather than reprove his promising pupil. Athenæus, again, relates that Socrates said in the presence of other pupils: "I dreamed that thou hast become a crow, and hast picked my bald head. I predict that thou wilt prate many falsehoods about me among the people." Now Athenæus was a lover of scandal and a person of uncritical habits. We may therefore allow little weight to such gossip, and attribute it to the hatred and envy of those who did not appreciate Plato.

Another piece of scandal coming from Athenæus is, that after the death of Socrates, when his dejected followers were at table together, Plato, taking a cup in his hand, said: "We should not suffer our courage to fail; I feel myself sufficiently strong to continue the school of Socrates;" and then reached a cup to Apollodorus, who replied: "I should prefer drinking the poisoned cup of Socrates to accepting a cup of wine from thee."

There is no question that there were dislikes and bickerings among the disciples of Socrates. They were a mixed company, as dissimilar in tastes and tendencies as is the heterogeneous mixture of the common world; yet all found a point of contact with the many-sided Socrates. The attempt to move together, outside the magic circle of his presence, was always attended with friction. Cebes, of Thebes, and Eucleides, of Megara, are, perhaps, the only two Socratics with whom Plato is known to have cherished much friendship. His relations to Antisthenes and Aristippus are known to have been those of intellectual hostility. It were not surprising, therefore, if there existed such enmity as appears in the reply attributed to Apollodorus. But the assumption laid to Plato's charge is not characteristic of the man, and besides is far from congenial to the occasion when the remark is said to have been uttered. However, it is easy to settle with Athenæus on the basis of his general credit.

We have now brought Plato through the period of his intercourse with Socrates, in which time the poet and dreamer is gradually merging into the hard-thinking, stern-minded philosopher. But we have not yet taken account of one very important series of influences by which the youthful thinker was surrounded, and with which he had to contend during most of the eight or nine years of his acquaintance with the great teacher. A descendant of Solon and Codrus, a youth of elegant culture and fair physique, a mind of towering proportions and immense grasp, these were qualities that could but distinguish him in Athens and render accessible to him all the avenues to public honor and political power. Here, again, we shall find in his refusal of what the world calls "golden oppor-

tunities," in his steady inquiry after "the good and the just," new reason to admire the man, and fresh material for a safe verdict upon the sum total of his character.

That Plato had, by nature's gift, all the qualities desirable to make a good statesman and a wise lawgiver, might, without much hazard, be inferred from his writings, though we could not have inferred it from the buddings of his youthful genius. The fact that he turned away from politics for *moral reasons* is in itself a strong argument that, if he had so determined, he might have rendered efficient service in the public councils of his country. Cicero expresses the opinion that, if so inclined, he might have become an excellent orator: *Equidem et Platonem existimo, si genus forense dicendi tractare voluisset, gravissime et copiosissime potuisse dicere.\**

The traditions of the family, coming down from ancestors wise and great in the public eye, must have been a more than ordinary incentive to pursue the attractions of public life. Add to these things the character of the times—a period when Athens was struggling with somewhat diminished glory, yet with undaunted courage and sublime energy, to maintain existence and empire against the combinations of a huge Spartan alliance, backed with Persian gold; a time when a youthful mind of noble aspirations might have proposed to himself to rescue the fair inheritance of Athenian institutions from corrupting designs at home and destructive coalitions abroad, and so to have left his name to posterity alongside those of Solon and Pericles; add these considerations, and we may possibly appreciate the strength of the forces urging young Plato to a political career. It is not for any one to say that the waning power and glory of Athens could but discourage a sagacious mind from the attempt to restore her. It was then evident, as it is now to the impartial historian, that the internal powers and moral energies of Athens were not corroded to any such degree as to forbid the hope of a noble future,† if, by any means, she could outride the storm then bursting on her back. With all her disadvantages she did outride it so far as, in the period immediately succeeding, to recover much of her power, and to produce nearly all her greatest orators and philosophers.

Let us now give audience to the philosopher himself, as we suppose, writing in advanced age, and setting forth, in a summary way, the views of life on which he had acted. He writes, (Epistle VII. :)

\* De Off. I, 1.

† In mature years Plato convinced himself that the Athenian *polity* was wrong, and to that he ascribed the existing corruption. (Vid. Ep. VII.)



"When a young man I anticipated, as soon as I should be master of myself, an immediate entrance into public life. About that time a change of fortunes befell the state, and the existing polity incurring the censure of many, a revolution was organized and effected.\* In the change of administration, the power was committed to one and fifty men. Of eleven of that number in the city, and ten in the Peiræus, it was required that one should regulate each of the agoræ.† The remaining thirty were autocratic rulers over all. Of these some happened to be my kinsmen and acquaintance;‡ and I, in my youthfulness, felt as one might be expected to feel under such circumstances. For I thought, in my simplicity, they were so guiding the state as shortly to restore the people from their practices of injustice to the following of honor and probity. Therefore I gave earnest heed to their doings. Now—seeing them in a little while proving by their deeds that the polity preceding them was a golden one in comparison; (for, not to mention other things that are notorious, they sent the aged Socrates, a man dear to me, and, I should not hesitate to say, the most just of his age, him they sent with others to drag an innocent citizen § to certain death, for no other purpose than that the virtue of Socrates might become a cover to their injustice: he, however, did not obey, but incurred every hazard rather than become partaker in their unholy deeds)—seeing all these things, and others of the same kind by no means trivial, I was indignant, and withdrew myself from the existing evils."

He goes on to say that, after the expulsion of the thirty and the revival of the Athenian polity, his tendencies to public life were re-awakened, and that, but for the clear conviction that the existing polities generally were *bad*, he should have taken the high road of statesmanship and oratory. Then follow these words, in striking consonance with the doctrine of the "Republic:"

"The state of the laws was quite beyond remedy, unless by some wonderful provision of fortune. And I was compelled to say, in praise of the right philosophy, that it belongs to *this* to secure justice in politics and to establish all the interests of private men; that therefore men will not cease to suffer evil before the class of right and true philosophers come into the supreme power of the state, or the class of the dynasts, by some happy providence, actually become philosophers."

The tone of moral earnestness here manifest characterized the philosopher through life, whether in correspondence with kings and tyrants or in the familiarities of the intellectual circle by which he was surrounded at Athens. If it were allowed to be misguided and

\* The account shows that the writer is speaking of the revolution of 404 B.C., which resulted in the appointment of the *thirty tyrants*, as they are called, under Lacedæmonian dictation. Plato was then twenty-four years of age.

† That is, should perform police duties, with subordinates at his command.

‡ *Kritias*, the president of the thirty, was Plato's uncle. *Charmides*, another uncle, though not of the thirty, was of their party, and became one of the *ten* who for a short time succeeded the thirty at the end of their eight months of terrific domination.

§ The citizen referred to was Leon, a native of Salamis. The Miletus who did obey this summons of the thirty was probably the same who afterward brought accusation against Socrates.

too little tempered by a sound *expediency*, which forms the core of every code of political morals, it must still command the deference and respect of rightly thinking persons. Yet, that our philosopher was misguided by his moral sense, is not to be hastily assumed. If it were true that he had withdrawn from the political affairs of his country out of sheer disgust for violations of friendship and the immoralities of individual men, he would be chargeable with dereliction of duty to his country. For men of moral principle were precisely such as her exigencies imperatively demanded. But, as we have seen, his course was the result of the conviction that the polity itself was wrong, and the reversal of that or the substitution of another was more than one man could hope to accomplish. He speaks of this point expressly, and grounds the relinquishment of hope on the want of partisans to advocate what we would call a right polity. Now whatever exceptions we might choose to take to the premises from which Plato deduced his conclusion, and whatever sentence we might pass upon the argument as unsound, it still remains that, his conclusion being such, honesty and integrity required him to act as he did, to withdraw from political circles, and endeavor, by teaching right doctrines of intelligence and practice to the superior minds among his countrymen, to strike, at length and by a circuitous process, at the ills which vitiated society. This was his avowed aim—not a mere whim of fancy or a dream of ecstasy, uttered in occasional rhapsodies, and forgotten amid sensual pleasures and intellectual diversions, but a deeply settled purpose, pursued with unceasing toil in conversation and writing, in travel and in diplomacy. Moral reform was the great aim of his life, an aim too often lost sight of by those who pore over his writings merely to find speculative theories. No man ever thought more profoundly on metaphysical questions; but his thinking, however abstruse and far-reaching, however various and ornate, was always subordinate to the practical aim. He ever stood at the antipodes of such carnal thinking and such partial generalization as characterized Aristippus and sanctioned his life of pleasure, while he was far removed from the unpractical misanthropy of the Cynics. We are able to criticise his moral system and point out its radical defect; but this we owe to a revelation which he did not enjoy. We can but think it a spectacle of great moral sublimity when, centuries before the "Light of the World" drew on him the robes of our mortality and spake to us "as never man spake," an Athenian thinker endeavored to sweeten the bitter waters of political and private corruption by teaching that "the good" and "the holy" are ideals in every human soul, the expression of the highest aims of life, and the end toward which we

aspire in proportion as we are intelligent. Accordingly, with him, as with Socrates, the absorbing aim was to make men intelligent, that they might clearly discern these ineffable beauties, these *ὀνείαι θεϊαί, ἀδιάφθοραί*, accompanied with the assurance, mistaken as we know, but as he could scarcely know, that the soul thus enlightened would forget every inferior joy in comparison, would scarcely remember the necessities of the body in the intensity of its devotion to these supernal perfections. How strongly does the very assumption of this propensity toward the divine in man, this appetency for the good and the holy, attest the moral purity and energy of the man who could affirm it, plead for it, and suffer for it even to the indignity of temporary enslavement. And if any of us have so far abused the knowledge of man conferred by the Gospel as to picture the God-given soul exclusively in colors drawn from the pit, then we need to go back to this almost inspired philosopher, and prepare ourselves to approach the Gospel of Christ with a better mind.

According to the reckoning we have adopted Plato was past twenty-eight years of age in 399 B.C., when his friend and teacher, Socrates, was condemned to drink the fatal hemlock. We get glimpses of the devoted pupil amid the perils of his master. He is mentioned in the Apology of Socrates as present in the dikastery at the time of the trial; and in the Phædon, one of the interlocutors represents Plato as absent from the prison on that memorable last day on account of ill health. These are the only instances in all the unquestioned writings of Plato wherein he has named himself. From this event begin his travels, his stay in Athens being rendered painful, if not dangerous, by the manifestations regarding Socrates. It is stated, to be sure, by Valerius Maximus, that he opened a school in Athens before the beginning of his travels. But this seems quite improbable, and at least needs confirmation. Uniform tradition traces the traveler first to Megara, where he spent at least several months in close intercourse with his friend Euclides, still studying and endeavoring to obtain for himself a systematic view of philosophy. He was attracted from Megara by the school of the Pythagoreans in Italy, for he made it part of his plan to examine all systems, in order not only that he might draw what was good therefrom, but that he might adequately apprehend his own system by understanding its relations to other developments in the intellectual world. In Tarentum he associated with Archytas, and possibly with Philolaus, though this latter is doubtful, inasmuch as Plato mentions Philolaus as teacher of Simmias and Cebes in Thebes, where, it would seem, he spent the latter part of his life. Plato was already too well known, perhaps, and too much esteemed

to become a mere pupil in his intercourse with the Italian philosophers, his relations with Eucleides being probably already known. That he was on a suitable equality with them is shown by an incident related in Plutarch's *Life of Marcellus*; an incident, too, which shows both the philosopher's diligent pursuit of knowledge and his consistent adherence to scientific method. Speaking of Eudoxus and Archytas as having taken the lead in teaching mechanics to the Syracusans, Plutarch adds: "That problem, for example, of two mean proportional lines, which cannot be found out geometrically, and yet is so necessary to the solution of other questions, they solved mechanically by the assistance of certain instruments called *mesolabes*, taken from conic sections. But when Plato inveighed against them, with great indignation, as corrupting and debasing the excellence of geometry by making her descend from incorporeal and intellectual to corporeal and sensible things, and obliging her to make use of matter which requires much manual labor and is the object of servile trades; then mechanics was separated from geometry, and, being a long time despised by the philosopher, was considered as a branch of the military art." The relations established between Plato and the Pythagorean philosophers were those of warm and abiding friendship, such as was not interrupted save by death.

From Italy our philosopher-student went to Cyrene to profit by the converse of Theodorus of that city, who was the most celebrated mathematician of the time; the same Theodorus who had lectured in Athens, and who is introduced in the *Theætetus*. He is represented as traveling thence into Egypt, and as ascending the Nile to Heliopolis, the great center of the Egyptian priesthood. Eudoxus is named as his traveling companion, and Strabo (*Lib. xvii, c. 1*) says he himself saw the rooms where Plato and Eudoxus sojourned. The length of time assigned to their stay in Egypt—thirteen years—which is mentioned by Strabo, (*u. s.*) must be considered as the entire period of travel. Supposing Plato to have left Athens very shortly after the death of Socrates, at which time he was twenty-eight years of age, and knowing him to have been *forty* years of age at the time of his first visit to Syracuse;\* assuming, as is most fitting, that this first visit was in the last year of his travels, and but little anterior to the opening of the Academy in Athens, after which, evidently, he could not have traveled extensively and for a great length of time, we thus determine with sufficient accuracy the entire period of travel to have been about *thirteen* years. This would bring the close of his travels to the year 386 or the year 385 B.C. But we have followed our travelers only to Egypt. Apuleius

\* Εχέδον ἔτη τετταράκοντα γεγονώς.—Ep. vii.

represents him as returning thence to Italy, doubtless out of friendship to the Pythagoreans, and partly, perhaps, to finish certain speculations regarding which his studies in Egypt furnished some new suggestions. Tradition makes him desirous of visiting the Magi of Persia, but that, hindered by a war in that country, he went no further eastward than Phœnicia, where he met some magi and made himself acquainted with their art. *Διὸ καὶ ἐν τῷ Τιμαίῳ*, says Olympiodorus, *φαίνεται τῆς θυτικής ἔμπειρος ὢν, σημεῖα τε λέγων ἥπατος καὶ σπλάγχνων καὶ τοιαῦτα τινά*. This looks quite like an invented accounting for Plato's knowledge of the soothsaying art, and is therefore to be doubted. Yet it is thought by some we find a confirmation of his eastern travels in what is related by Plutarch, (*De Dem. Soc.*, c. viii.) where Simmias is made to represent Plato and himself as tarrying in Caria after leaving Egypt, and there meeting some Delians who besought Plato to show them how to double the altar in Delos, a task enjoined on them by the Delphic oracle as a means of averting certain calamities, and an undertaking which they who had attempted had as yet failed to accomplish, since by doubling every side of the cube they had increased its solid contents eightfold. Plato, however, solved the problem by means of the knowledge acquired in Egypt.

Whether this account is trustworthy or not, whatever were the travels of Plato in the East, they were antecedent to the second visit in Italy. During this second Italian visit, as is most probable, he met with Dion, of Syracuse, then quite a young man, possessed of great wealth, and connected with the family of the tyrant Dionysius the elder. This young man was inspired with a marvelous enthusiasm by the conversations of Plato, and yielded his heart to the love of philosophy and the pursuit of an excellent life. Plato now visited Sicily, probably in some degree through Dion's influence. He came to Syracuse, and Dion, in the transports of his enthusiasm, imagined the tyrant could not but be interested in the man who had so electrified himself. But the neophyte was destined to disappointment. The tyrant was not particularly enamored of virtue. The man of power had no great admiration of abstract truth; and, in the world of concrete realities, that which he valued was how to bring poverty and subjection to the people, power and wealth to Dionysius. The philosopher, so gentle and considerate of an ingenuous young man, was stern and uncompromising toward a mind hardened by tyranny and conceited with power. "Whom do you regard as the happiest of men?" asked Dionysius. "Socrates," was the answer. "What do you think to be the business of a statesman?" "To make the citizens better."

"What, then, do you think the administration of justice a small thing?" "Little, indeed, and the least part of a statesman's duty; for those even who administer rightly are but like tailors who mend torn garments." Somewhat disconcerted, the tyrant then asked: "What, then, do you think a tyrant to be? Is he not manly?" (*ἀνδρείος*.) "The most cowardly of all, since he fears the barber's razor, lest he perish by it." Now Dionysius is the man who, through fear of the barbers, never shaved, but singed his beard with a live coal. Consistently, he ordered Plato to leave Syracuse before sunset, and putting him in charge of Pollis, the Æginetan, then trading to Syracuse, instructed the latter to sell Plato as a slave. We have substantially followed Olympiodorus in the narrative of this intercourse with Dionysius, the visit and its result being also narrated by several others, as Diodorus and Plutarch, with slight variations. The story, though sometimes doubted, seems too well corroborated to be rejected, and is, by Mr. Grote, incorporated into his History of Greece. This able historian observes: "It seems to be a certain fact that Plato was really sold and became, for a moment, a slave."\* Being sold in Ægina, the purchaser was Anniceris, who declined the money when offered for his ransom by Plato's friends. This money was therefore employed in the purchase of the Academy, where henceforth the philosopher, surrounded by eager and admiring friends and pupils, discoursed of the sublimest topics accessible to the human mind. His mode of life here was simple. The only person abiding permanently with him was Timon, called the Misanthrope. His pupils and friends enjoyed one meal a day with him, probably at their own expense. His discourses, doubtless, were chiefly in the form of dialogue, as best carrying out the Socratic tendency, and most conducive to that dialectic culture which was the first need of the philosophic intellect of that age. Whether he had an esoteric as well as exoteric doctrine has not been determined, though the hypothesis seems to be favored by the seventh epistle.

As to the order of time in which his writings appeared, but little definite information is attainable. The *Lysis* and the *Phædrus* have already been assigned to his earlier life. The *Timæus*, the *Republic*, and the *Laws* are commonly regarded as the last; but the order of these three is not quite certain, except that the other two were prior to the *Laws*. This last is mentioned in the third epistle as having been in the hands of his Syracusan friends not long before the overthrow of the younger Dionysius by Dion, which event took place in 354 B.C.

\* Hist. Greece, vol. xi, p. 39.



Attempts have been made by distinguished German scholars to determine the internal relations of the several dialogues, so as to make of them a consistent, logical whole, and implying that the chronological order must have corresponded with the logical order. But the case is far from being made out. And when we regard, as we must, each dialogue as a distinct treatise, whatever its relations to the others, we can but call it a preposterous assumption that Plato's mind—any more than another man's—could have developed from beginning to end according to a preconceived plan. That a general outline of progress, in which logical and chronological order would occasionally coincide, just as a line describing the moon's orbit occasionally crosses a line describing the orbit of the earth, could have been drawn by Plato himself, adequately symbolizing the correspondencies and divergencies between the advance of his years and the development of his system, may not be disputed. But that any one can now make even a respectable approximation to the truth on grounds internal to Plato's writings, is too much to assume.

The number of Plato's regular pupils is said to have been twenty-eight. Among them we have the names of Speusippus, his nephew; Xenocrates, of Chaldeon; Aristotle, of Stagira; Heracleides Ponticus; Histiaeus, of Perinthus; Philippus, the Opuntian. Many distinguished men heard him occasionally, among whom are named Chabrias, Iphicrates, Timotheus, Phocion, Hyperides, Lycurgus, Isocrates. It is said also that women, attired in men's clothes, attended his lectures. He is said to have had a *thin* voice.

The retirement of the Academy was twice invaded by the demand for a mission of philosophy in Syracuse. The philosopher, true to his practical aim, seeing, as he thought, a providential opportunity for the application of the grand principles of philosophy to the life of the people, and influenced much, no doubt, by the glowing representations of Dion, incurred every hazard for so great an end. We shall not stop to detail what has already been so ably set forth by the historic pen; how pompously the great teacher was received, and how the Syracusan court was turned to the study of geometry with all the ardor of school-boys; how the cares of government seemed for a time to have lost their charms for the tyrant, and the people were looking forward to a reformed polity and a reformed ruler; how the change of manners and the absence of dissipation at court irritated the minions of luxury and vice, and the manners of Dion, always unfortunate for a man who needed popular support, were now interpreted into a positive pretension to the supreme power; how an exiled demagogue was brought back by a faction to

lead the partisans of licentious power against the adherents of a rigid virtue; how the tyrant's ear was gained by flatterers, and the magic spell of passion converted the unyielding advocate of truth into a revolutionist and an enemy in the eyes of the court; how once and again the man of virtue was compelled to flee a threatened death, and how, at length, the abused and exiled Dion, after overthrowing the inimical power, became himself, by stern adherence to his principles, the victim of treason and assassination. The hope of the philosopher, that a man in power should "actually become a philosopher" was dashed to the ground, and the direct effort at the reformation of a worldly court was signally abortive.

But may we not, from the history of the philosopher's failure, furnish ourselves with a valuable lesson for practical life?

On the one hand we see a tyrannical power founded in injustice and maintained by despotic means. The incumbent of the tyrant's throne, under genial instruction, seems arriving at a conviction of the injustice of his power, and inquiring after a practicable way of mitigating its severity, if not of changing its organization. We see the sovereign inviting a wise man—one known to be hostile to tyranny and likewise averse to democracy—to furnish counsel for the amelioration of his kingdom. On the other hand, we see the courtiers and the partisans of power full of intrigue, and identifying all their interests with the polity as it is. The people, submissive to the existing regime, are ready to welcome a popular government at all times, and glad of any approach to it. Now a wise man should be always aware that a government cannot be materially changed by a deliberate aim and an avowed policy without *conflict of parties*, and that often *deadly*. Plato ought to have observed that his proposition to transform the Syracusan government into a moderate and wise aristocracy must *immediately* awaken the hostility of the court party, and *eventually*, if that hostility were disarmed or evaded, would come into inevitable collision with popular prejudices. In either event, prudence required to prepare the way for sustaining the conflict before arousing the elements of war. To avow his aim, however modestly, and to go deliberately to work at making a philosopher of Dionysius, was the most impolitic of all things. Here was the philosopher's mistake. Had he, in concert with Dion, while avowing no ulterior aim, secured the authority of the tyrant for certain measures of reform to which the very interests of the courtiers themselves might have been linked by a masterly hand, he might have succeeded, by degrees, in a certain, sure advance toward the realization of his political ideal. But Plato was

*not a man of policy.* He had no knowledge of artifice in the attainment of even a good end. To work behind a screen, with an ostensible aim very different from the real one, was something utterly repugnant to this great and good man's principles. The distinction between prudence and hypocrisy was, in his mind, scarcely perceptible. He must always act openly and avowedly, directly toward the goal of his efforts. For this we can but *love* him more. Yet this supreme virtue of his character made him unfit to be a statesman and a reformer. His place was to teach, and let others apply. A statesman must always consult policy as well as abstract duty. A reformer must be sufficiently *conservative* to attach his schemes to the existing order so far as to prevent the appearance of aiming at violence. This policy in the statesman, this conservatism in the reformer should not be identified with corrupt artifice, with kingcraft and priestcraft. It is but the *practical side of virtue*. It is holiness striving to adapt intractable materials to its end; and, finding them not yet prepared, seeking to prepare them by postponing something of its desired fruits to a later date, and perhaps adopting them, at last, in an altered outward embodiment. It is St. Paul becoming all things to all men, that he may win some. It is the human representation of Providence:

"Deep in unfathomable mines  
Of never-failing skill,  
He treasures up his vast designs,  
And works his sov'reign will."

In this the great philosopher was utterly deficient. Hence, the hopes of Syracusan citizens failed. Hence, the hopes of philosophy to find an embodiment in polity perished. Hence, the throne of Dionysius was doomed in 354 B.C. to feel the shock of a thunderbolt wielded by the arm of the virtuous Dion, now returned from exile. Hence, the noble liberator, at the end of two years, falls a victim to treason by the hand of his friend. Hence, the necessity of Plato's long and prosy letters to justify himself to Dion's friends and the public. Hence, the qualification imposed upon our almost unlimited praise of the great philosopher.

But that a man should become impractical by continued abstract thinking is no wonder, but, on the other hand, is to be expected; and the services done by Plato to the human intellect are doubtless far greater than he had rendered as a statesman and reformer.

This excellent man had *twelve* years of peaceful, thoughtful retirement to enjoy after his third return from Syracuse, excepting only the anxiety occasioned by Dion's affairs. His letters show,

too, that his intellectuality had not absorbed his affection. With true humanity he provided, through the assistance of friends, wedding-portions for his nieces. Himself never entered into conjugal bonds, and his only household was his assembly at the Academy. At length, in 348 B.C., on his eighty-first or eighty-second birthday, while present at a marriage-supper, death gently stole upon him, and he was no more. He was buried in the Cerameicus, not far from the Academy. The grateful Athenians erected a monument to his memory with the following beautiful epitaph:

Τὸν δὲ Ἀπόλλων φῶσ'  
 Ἀσκληπιὸν ἦδε Πλάτωνα·  
 Τὸν μὲν ἵνα ψυχῇν, τὸν δ'  
 ἵνα σῶμα, σοδοί.—Olymp.

#### ART. III.—THE "EDWARDEAN" THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT.

*The Atonement: Discourses and Treatises by Edwards, Smalley, Macey, Emmons, Griffin, Burge, and Weeks.* With an Introductory Essay by EDWARDS A. PARK, Abbot Professor of Christian Theology, Andover, Massachusetts, Boston: Congregational Board of Publication. 1859.

THE book whose title we have here transcribed contains New England's contribution to the literature of the Atonement. It gives us the results of a long period of intensely earnest speculation upon this central truth of Christianity. We propose, firstly, to briefly characterize the book itself; secondly, to state the theory advocated; and thirdly, to investigate the relation of the theory to Arminianism.

I. THE BOOK, then, may be summarily described as a substantial octavo of six hundred and sixty-three pages, of which eighty are introductory. It is gotten up in the plain but neat style by which most of the publications of the Congregational Board are characterized. Respecting the origin of the collection, neither editor nor publishers give us any information. Those persons, however, who were familiar with the clerical libraries of New England a generation or two ago, will perhaps remember a little old sheep-bound duodecimo, which used frequently to be found in those libraries, and which bore upon its back the same title as the book we are now describing. Should they take the pains to look up a copy of it, they will find that it contained more than half the treatises which Professor Park has here reprinted, together with other articles

written in the same general spirit. We suppose a reprint of this old collection was considered desirable, and the Andover professor invited to improve the favorable opportunity for re-editing it.

The contents of the book are as follows: 1. "Three sermons on the Necessity of Atonement, and the consistency between that and Free Grace in forgiveness." By Jonathan Edwards, D. D., pp. 1-42. 2. "Two sermons—Justification through Christ an act of Free Grace," and "None but Believers saved through the all-sufficient satisfaction of Christ." By John Smalley, D. D., pp. 43-85. 3. "A Discourse designed to explain the Doctrine of the Atonement." By Jonathan Maxcy, D. D., pp. 87-110. This discourse was delivered in the chapel of "Rhode Island College" on the 11th and 25th of November, 1796, Dr. Maxcy being at that time President of said college. 4. "Two sermons on the Atonement." By Nathaniel Emmons, D. D., pp. 111-136. 5. "An humble attempt to reconcile the differences of Christians respecting the Extent of the Atonement." By Edward D. Griffin, D. D., pp. 137-427. This is the most elaborate performance in the whole book. It is a carefully written treatise of nearly three hundred octavo pages, well known to many of our clerical readers in another form, and generally regarded as the masterpiece of its acute and once distinguished author.\* An excellent *resumé* of Dr. Griffin's views, as set forth in

° For the benefit of such as may not be acquainted with this important essay we subjoin the Table of Contents:

Preface. Introduction.

PART I. *Nature of the Atonement.* Chapter I. Atonement merely the ground of release from the Curse. II. Influence of Atonement upon Divine Government. III. Matter of Atonement. IV. Christ's Obedience and Reward. V. Atonement not Reconciliation. VI. Meaning of Righteousness as connected with the Justification of Believers. VII. Mistakes arising from drawing literal Conclusions from figurative Premises.

PART II. *Extent of the Atonement.* Chapter I. Curse of Abandonment removed from all. II. Grand point of division between the parties. III. View of the subject taken by the Synod of Dort. IV. Atonement for Moral Agents only. V. The two characters of Man distinct and independent of each other. VI. Nothing belonged to the Atonement but what was public. VII. Attributes of Moral Agents. VIII. A Moral Government. IX. Moral Agents treated as if there were no Foreknowledge. X. Moral Agents treated conditionally. XI. Believer and Unbeliever confounded with Elect and Non-elect, and with Man as a Capable Agent. XII. Treatment of Agents by itself expresses Divine Benevolence. XIII. Purposes of the Moral Governor not to be confounded with those of the Sovereign Efficient Cause. XIV. Treatment of Individual Agents intended to influence Agents generally. XV. Reasons for an Atonement for those who perish. XVI. Extent of the provision not incidental, but purposely intended. XVII. Reprobation and the order of the Divine Decrees. XVIII. Covenant of Redemption. XIX. One whole meaning at one view. XX. Bottom of the mistake lies in

this treatise, will be found in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, 1858. It was drawn up by Professor Park, and the "understood but unexpressed" design of the essay spoken of by Dr. Whedon in noticing it (*Methodist Quarterly*, vol. xl, p. 311,) no longer needs explanation. 6. "An Essay on the Scripture Doctrine of the Atonement: its Nature, its Necessity, and its Extent." By Caleb Burge, A. M., pp. 429-546. This essay was first published three years after the issue of Dr. Griffin's, that is, in the year 1822. 7. "A Dialogue on the Atonement." By William R. Weeks, D. D., pp. 547-583. First published in 1823, and now printed for the fourth time. According to Professor Park, it "received a lengthened reply in the fourth volume of the *Christian Advocate*." The paper referred to, however, is not our metropolitan Methodist organ, but a Calvinistic publication, issued at that time in Philadelphia under the editorship of Dr. Ashbel Green.

The Introductory Essay by Professor Park on the *Rise of the Edwardean Theory of the Atonement* is a very elaborate and valuable article. It is an important contribution to the yet unwritten history of New England Puritanism. Its erudite and painstaking author takes us back to the writings of the four distinguished divines under the influence of whose teachings Edwards the younger, his associates and disciples, seem to have matured their views; and in those writings points out, with an industry more easily commended than rivalled, the first faint unconscious deviations from traditional Calvinism, both in the intellectual apprehension of the doctrine and in its systematic statement, which suggested and almost logically necessitated the peculiar theory and terminology of New School Calvinism. Those four divines were Edwards the senior, Bellamy, Hopkins, and West.

"The first of these four men was the father of Dr. Edwards, the second was his theological teacher, the third was his most valued counselor, and was intimately associated with him in the examination of his father's manuscripts, and the fourth was his constant friend. Through Dr. Edwards, the hints and tendencies of these four divines were transferred in a modified and stimulating form to his pupils, Dwight and Griffin; to his friends Backus and Smalley. Through Dr. Smalley, the formative influences of his instructor Bellamy were applied, in a modified and animating way, to Emmons, the pupil of Smalley

overlooking Human Agency. XXI. Importance of correct language on the subject.

PART III. *Scriptural View*. Chapter I. Plan of the Argument. II. Benefit of the Atonement made over to all. III. All Men bound to make the benefit their own. IV. Actual influence of the Atonement upon all. V. Synod of Dort agreed with us as to the actual influence of the Atonement upon the Non-elect, and the purpose of the Sacred Persons. VI. Testimony of Calvin, Watts, and others. VII. Atonement offered and accepted expressly for all. Appendix.



and the friend of Hopkins and West. Through Samuel Spring, a pupil of Bellamy, of Hopkins, and of West, and, in a double sense, the brother of Emmons, the personal influences of these divines was transfused into the constitution of the Andover Theological Seminary. In similar methods have a multitude of theologians been interlocked, more or less intimately, with the four men whose express instructions or tacit intimations have either introduced, or paved the way for introducing, the Edwardean Theory of the Atonement."—P. lxxviii.

In the writings of each of these four theologians, Professor Park finds principles and statements which, intentionally or unintentionally, favored the view afterward developed. These principles and statements he allows were often totally inconsistent with others inculcated with equal emphasis by these writers; but "it is the prerogative of clear thinkers, when they proclaim an error, to proclaim it in such a way as will suggest the truth to other thinkers equally clear." He traces out the rude inception and earliest developments of the theory so elaborately as to leave no room for the suspicion that that grand Arminianizing of New England Puritanism with reference to the doctrine of the Atonement, of which the book before us is the monument, was effected by foreign influences. He makes it evident that Edwards and Griffin arrived at Arminian results, not by the perusal of Remonstrant literature, but by the same process which conducted Arminius, Camero, and Baxter to a common repudiation of Calvin's narrow and indefensible view. New England thus furnishes a new and independent proof of the oft illustrated truth, that unmitigated genuine Calvinism is incapable of maintaining itself for any considerable length of time in any Church which has the religious necessities of an entire community to which to minister. The Puritan Church has, in this respect, but repeated the history of French, English, Swiss, and Netherlandic Calvinism, only in a more striking and decisive manner.

So much for the book and its contents.

II. THE THEORY ADVOCATED. The view of the Atonement developed and supported by the various writers before us is summed up by Professor Park in the following propositions:

1. "Our Lord suffered pains which were substituted for the penalty of the law, and may be called punishment in the more general sense of that word, but were not, strictly and literally, the penalty which the law had threatened.

2. "The sufferings of our Lord satisfied the general justice of God, but did not satisfy his distributive justice.

3. "The humiliation, pains, and death of our Redeemer were equivalent in meaning to the punishment threatened in the moral law, and thus they satisfied Him who is determined to maintain the honor of this law, but they did not satisfy the demands of the law itself for our punishment.

4. "The active obedience, viewed as the holiness, of Christ was honorable to the law, but was not a work of supererogation, performed by our substitute,

and then transferred and imputed to us so as to satisfy the requisitions of the law for our own active obedience.

"The last three statements are sometimes comprehended in the more general proposition, that the atonement was equal, in the meaning and spirit of it, to the payment of our debts; but it was not literally the payment of either our debt of obedience or our debt of punishment, or any other debt which we owed to law or distributive justice. Therefore,

5. "The law and the distributive justice of God, although honored by the life and death of Christ, will yet eternally demand the punishment of every one who has sinned.

6. "The atonement rendered it consistent and desirable for God to save all who exercise evangelical faith, yet it did not render it obligatory in him, in distributive justice, to save them.

7. "The atonement was designed for the welfare of all men: to make the eternal salvation of all men possible; to remove all the obstacles which the honor of the law and of distributive justice presented against the salvation of the non-elect as well as the elect.

8. "The atonement does not constitute the reason why some men are regenerated and others not, but this reason is found only in the sovereign, electing will of God: 'Even so, father! for so it seemed good in thy sight.'

9. "The atonement is useful on men's account, and in order to furnish new motives to holiness; but it is necessary on God's account, and in order to enable him as a consistent ruler to pardon any, even the smallest sin, and therefore to bestow on sinners any, even the smallest favor."

Such is the theory. It has been denominated the New Theory, the New England Theory, the New School Theory, the Hopkinsian Theory, the Governmental Theory, the Consistent Theory, etc., etc. Professor Park prefers to call it the "Edwardean Theory."

III. AUTHORSHIP OF THIS THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT. Most of these names which have been applied to the theory before us seem to intimate that the theory itself is something "new." One of them expressly attributes it to Dr. Hopkins, and another to Dr. Edwards. The editor always speaks of it as original with the so-called "New England Divines." Indeed, he definitely claims for them the honor of having "reduced old truths to a *new system*—a system more consistent than had previously been drawn out." It will be proper, in the present section, to inquire into the legitimacy of this claim. Reducing these "new" or "Edwardean" teachings to their appropriate heads, according as they may bear upon the nature, necessity, or extent of the Atonement, we shall compare them with the "old" teachings of Arminianism on the same points, and see whether the discrepancy be so great as to render it necessary to discriminate the two systems by distinctive names:

I. *The NATURE of the Atonement.* In what consists the Atonement, then, according to the teachings of this "new divinity?" In what does it consist according to the old Arminian divines? And first, what say Edwards and his successors?

1. It did not consist, as genuine Calvinism affirms, in Christ's suffering the literal penalty of the law in the transgressors' stead.

Professor Park expresses the sense of the writers before us on this point as follows: "Our Lord suffered pains which were substituted for the penalty of the law, and may be called punishment in the more general sense of that word, but were not, strictly and literally, the penalty which the law had threatened."—P. x. Burge says, p. 500: "The sufferings of Christ are to be viewed as a *substitute* for the execution of the penalty of the law;" and Griffin, p. 235, goes so far as to say: "Christ *could* not sustain our legal punishment, or the literal penalty of the law." Similar expressions are found in nearly every one of the "Discourses and Treatises" before us. Let us see if this teaching originated with Edwards.

Turning to Episcopius's works, *Lectiones Sacre, in I Epist. Joannis*, cap. ii, 2, we find four different views of the nature of the sufferings of Christ presented and discussed. The first of these is that which affirms that Christ suffered the literal penalty of the law, and after a due consideration it is decidedly, almost indignantly, rejected. Take up Curcellæus, and in his *Religionis Christianæ Institutio*, lib. v, cap. xix, 15–20, we find an elaborate proof of this thesis: "*Non ergo, ut vulgo putant, satisfecit [Christus] patiendo omnes pœnas quas peccatis nostris merueramus.*" Open again at the thirtieth section of his "*Dissertatio de Vocibus Trinitatis*," and you will find a masterly summary of his former argument. Limborch roundly asserts of the contra-Remonstrant view, "*Nullum habet in Scriptura fundamentum.*"—*Theol. Christ.*, lib. iii, cap. xxi, 6. Further on he shows that it has no foundation in reason either. In this respect, then, New England Calvinists but reiterate the clear and well-known teachings of primitive Arminianism.

2. "The atonement of Christ does not consist essentially in his active or positive obedience."—*Edwards*, p. 31.

At the close of a long investigation on this point, Burge announces his conclusion as follows: "Hence it appears that the scheme which places the Atonement in the obedience of Christ is totally without foundation, either in reason or the word of God."—P. 486. Professor Park formulates the New School doctrine on this head in the following terms: "The active obedience, viewed as the holiness, of Christ was honorable to the law, but was not a work of supererogation, performed by our substitute, and then transferred and imputed to us, so as to satisfy the requisitions of the law for our own active obedience."—P. x. What is this but the very doctrine which it cost the Remonstrant divines so much personal maltreatment to establish.

We find quite a full exhibit of Arminius's views upon this subject

in a letter to Uytenbogardt, written in the year 1604, on the occasion of Piscator's controversy with the Gallic synod on the subject of Justification. *Epistolæ Eccles. et Theol.*, Ep. lxx. He regarded the righteousness of Christ as requisite only as a qualification for his office; (*ut posset Mediatoris fungi munere, justus esse debuit, non modo justitia nativa et inherente, sed etiam activa, quæ constat obedientia legis perfectu*;) just as Emmons, in the work before us, says, (p. 134, note,) "his obedience only prepared him to make Atonement, his blood made it." See also Arminius's Declaration of Sentiments, cap. ix; Defense against XXXIX Articles, second series, iv; Fourteenth Public Disputation, x-xvi; Thirty-fifth Private Disputation, v.

His followers uniformly maintained the same view. Episcopus (*Opera*, t. ii, p. 166, b.) gives the reason why the Remonstrants were unwilling in their declaration to use the phrase, "the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us." Curcellæus (*Opera*, p. 825, b.) has no patience with the use of the word "merit" in connection with Christ in any way. Limborch, (lib. iii, cap. xxi, 2,) in like manner, finds in the holiness of Christ nothing more than an official qualification: "*Ut esset victima immaculata et sacerdos sanctus*." His active obedience was not substitutional and transferable, and hence formed no part of his vicarious work.

3. The Atonement of Christ did not consist in the vicarious payment of a debt.

Griffin says, (p. 223,) "it had none of the attributes of a commercial transaction." . . . "This notion of paying our debt stands diametrically opposed to every idea of pardon, and to all those representations of a free and gracious justification with which the Scriptures abound. What remission or grace can there be in discharging a bankrupt when his debts are paid?" etc., etc. For other rejections of this view by the other divines before us, see pp. x, xiv, lxi, lxxii, 18, 104, 489, 490, 513, 564. In all this, however, the New England divines were anticipated by their illustrious Netherlandic prototypes. Hear Limborch as he states the same objection to the commercial view which Griffin, a century later, repeats: "*Si Christus pro nobis omnia, ad minimum usque quadrantem, persolvit, nihil restat quod Pater ex gratia nobis condonare possit*."—*Theol. Christ.*, p. 261, a. "If Christ has paid our debts for us even to the last and least farthing, there remains nothing which the Father can gratuitously remit to us." But even Limborch is here only borrowing from his predecessor Curcellæus.\* "Nam si Christus morte

\* Even as early as Anselm's time this view of the Atonement was seen to involve the difficulty mentioned. In his "*Cur Deus homo*," lib. i, cap. xix, 15-17,

sua persolvit usque ad ultimum quadrantem omne id quod Deo pro peccatis nostris debebamus, nihil supererit quod Deus nobis gratuito remittere potuerit; veluti si creditor totum quod ipsi debetur a sponsore accepit, nihil remittit debitori cum debitum ab eo non reposcit; sed id facere ex stricto jure tenetur, nisi velit iniquus haberi, qui idem debitum bis sibi persolvi petat."—*Institutio*, lib. v, xix, 17.

4. The Atonement of Christ consisted in a satisfaction of the *general* justice of God, effected by the sufferings and death of Christ.

*General* justice is here distinguished from *commutative* and from *retributive*. The theory which makes the Atonement consist in a satisfaction of *retributive* justice is that which teaches that Christ vicariously suffered the literal penalty of the law. The theory which makes it consist in the payment of our debts by Christ as a sponsor, regards it as a satisfaction to *commutative* justice. Both these views the Edwardean divines, following the example of the "New School" divines of Holland, decidedly reject, as we have above seen. In making the Atonement consist in a satisfaction of God's *general* justice, a mere "ground of release from the curse," they adopt the view almost universally prevalent among Arminians, and which found in Arminian GROTIUS its author and earliest advocate.

Whatever imperfections or possible inconsistencies the work of Grotius "On the Satisfaction of Christ" may present, it has the great and original merit of discriminating betwixt the *essential* and the *rectoral* characters of God. From the time of Anselm up to the time of the publication of this treatise, representations of the Atonement were current which, if they did not justify the criticisms of Socinus, at least furnished abundant occasion for misconception. Grotius may have objectified the law too much to suit many,\* but to have announced clearly, and for the first time, the principle that the satisfaction rendered by Christ was not a satisfaction rendered to a supposed wrath of God, but to God's *administrative* justice—"justitiæ Dei rectoriæ"—that was enough to immortalize any theologian, however destitute of other claims to distinction. This

Boso, the author's imaginary interlocutor, is represented as presenting the objection, "If our debts are completely paid how can we pray *forgive* us our debts?" to which the archbishop responds for the time, "Qui non solvit, frustra dicit: *Dimitte*; qui autem solvit, supplicat, quoniam hoc ipsum pertinet ad solutionem ut *supplicet*; nam Deus nulli quidquam debet, sed omnis creatura illi debet; et ideo non expedit homini ut agat cum Deo, quemadmodum par cum pari." A very unsatisfactory reply.

\* See THOLUCK's "Lehre von der Sünde und vom Versöhnung," s. 99; also, HAGENBACH's *Dogmengeschichte*, s. 653.

annunciation was Grotius's contribution to the dogmatic *ausbildung* of the doctrine of the Atonement. The prerogative of punishing, taught Grotius, belongs to God, not as an *injured party*, but as *moral governor*. Hence the prerogative of substituting something in the place of punishment competes to God, not as an *injured party* but as *moral governor*. If able by other means than punishing to secure the ends of moral government—"ordinis nimirum conservationem et exemplum"—he is at liberty to employ them, and remit the penalty to transgressors. The Atonement of Christ does so effectually secure these ends of moral government, that God is able to forgive sin under evangelical conditions without impairing the authority of his law. Wherein does the "Edwardian" theory differ from this? As to the *nature* of the Atonement, then, we do not see that the New England divines have brought forward anything new. They have simply renounced the Calvinistic view and adopted the Arminian. We do not say that all the Dutch Arminian divines came to as clear a conception of the subject as Grotius; they did not. Limborch, for instance, seems to have inclined more toward the elder sacrificial theory; but they all unanimously rejected the old contra-Remonstrant theories which New School Calvinism now claims the honor of having exploded. Episcopius, the greatest of them all, may properly be counted among the positive indorsers of Grotius, for we are told in a letter from Gerardus Vossius to Hugo Grotius (A. D. 1617) that he (Episcopius) spoke of having read the "*Defensio Fidei Catholicæ de Satisfactione Christi*" with pleasure, and that in his opinion "*nihil ingeniosius, eruditius, solidius, ea in controversia, a quoquam scriptum esse.*" We think, then, that no one will question the propriety of styling the teaching of New England theology respecting the *nature* of the Atonement *Arminian*. And if correctly described by this term, why embarrass and perplex theological science with a newly coined and superfluous one?

II. *The ground of the NECESSITY of Christ's Atonement.* Was the Atonement made by Christ absolutely necessary in order to enable God to be just, and yet the justifier of him who should believe? Could not God have forgiven sin without that satisfaction being rendered to justice? If he could not, what was it which prevented? These questions are older than any scientific theory of the nature of the Atonement, and their discussion has not yet ceased. As long ago as the time of Augustine men seem to have been found who denied that God *could* have redeemed us in any other mode than that actually adopted. The zealous old father called them *dolts, stulti*;) declared that other ways were possible, but that had they



been adopted they would have been to such minds equally distasteful with the present. (*De Agone Christi*, c. 11.) Anselm's scheme rendered an infinite merit necessary, and as none but a divine being could furnish such a merit, of course a *divine* Redeemer was indispensable. Abelard, on the contrary, denied the necessity of any satisfaction whatever; and such doctors disagreeing, the other scholastics were free to discuss the whole subject from their respective points of view without incurring ecclesiastical censure. The result was a general adoption by the Church of the view of Anselm, according to which the precise mode adopted by God in human redemption was not arbitrary, but the only possible one. Soon after the Reformation the theologians of both the Lutheran and of the Reformed Churches returned to their scholastic speculations, and exhibited a strong tendency to conceive of Christ's incarnation and mediatorial work, not as free expedients of the divine administration, but as things necessitated by the divine nature apart from all governmental considerations. To counteract this tendency was one of the providential missions of Arminianism. The service rendered to the cause of scientific theology in this department by the Arminians is now gratefully acknowledged by the Calvinists themselves. EBRARD, one of the most distinguished divines of whom the Reformed Church can now boast, in a recent work upon the Atonement, attributes to the Remonstrant theologians the new and more salutary tendency which theological speculation took in their age. When Genevan speculatists had spread the network of fatalism over God himself, the Arminians were raised up to assert and maintain the freedom of the Moral Governor.\*

\* The passage is worthy of transcription: "Die kirchliche Dogmatik beider Confessionen hatte den Trieb, die Heilthat Christi als eine schlechthin *nothwendige*, und zwar durch eine in Gottes *Wesen*, nicht in Gottes *Willen* liegende Nothwendigkeit bedingte, aufzufassen. Die *necessitas* satisfactionis vicariae wurde behauptet. Da waren es nun die Arminianer, welche dieser Tendenz entgegentraten, der speculativen Begründung die schlichte biblische Aussage, der *necessitas* das *arbitrium Dei* entgegenstellten. Gott hat *diesen* Weg der Versöhnung gewählt, nicht weil er zu ihm als dem einzig möglichen genöthigt gewesen wäre, sondern weil er diesen Weg—für gut gehalten hat. Die Schrift sagt: Gott *hat* ihn eingeschlagen, das muss uns genug sein; wir sollen nicht nachweisen wollen, dass er ihn habe einschlagen *müssen*. Wie in diesem, so wehren sich die Arminianer in allen Dogmen gegen den Zwang, den die damalige Scholastik ihnen mit ihrer *necessitas* anthun wollte. Dieselben Arminianer, welche die Freiheit des menschlichen Willens gegen das *decretum absolutum* verfochten, kämpften ebenso für die Freiheit der Heilsbeschlüsse Gottes gegenüber der Behauptung einer den Ewigen selber *bindenden* Nothwendigkeit. Eine Combination politischer und kirchlicher Parteistellungen was es, welche die Arminianer aus "der Kirche" hinausdrängte, ihnen die Stellung "einer Secte" anwies; aber nicht zum Heil

The necessity of *an* atonement in order to a safe and proper remittance of penalty is not the same thing as the necessity of precisely *that* atonement made by Christ. The scholastic discussions were upon the latter, those of our time rather upon the former. The divines of New England have asserted that *an* atonement was necessary:

1. Not to render God propitious toward the transgressor. Burge in chapter ii of his essay very fairly represents the views the Edwardean divines hold on this point. Divine benevolence is the cause, not the effect, of the Atonement. Rom. v, 8; 1 John iv, 10; John iii, 16. This was Arminius's view. In Public Disputation XIV. xvi, he says: "It was not the effect of those stripes that God might love his creature, but that while love of justice presented no obstacle, through his love for the creature he could remit sins and bestow eternal life." Curcellæus maintained the same thing: "Sacrae literæ ubique gratuitum Dei amorem erga homines peccatores prædicant, tanquam salutis ipsorum fontem, a quo cætera omnia beneficia salutaria promanant; qualia sunt, Jesu Christi missio in mundum, et peccatorum nostrorum per sanguinem et oblationem ipsius expiatio. . . . Ergo non fuit necessarium, ut Christus justitiæ divinæ satisfecisset, antequam Deus nos amare posset, et peccata nobis condonare. *Inst.*, lib. v, cap. xix, 17.

2. An atonement was not necessary to satisfy retributive justice. Such a ground of necessity for the work of Christ could of course be maintained only by such as make that work to consist in a satisfaction of the demands of retributive justice. How foreign such a view of the Atonement was to the "Edwardean" divines we have already seen. We find furthermore, pp. 107, 566-568, explicit repudiations of such an explanation of the necessity of an atonement. It evidently involves the principle that God, by a constitutional necessity, *MUST* visit transgression with condign punishment. With such a principle no theory of the Atonement can harmonize save the "commercial" one.

Among the Reformers, Peter Martyr and Musculus expressly rejected the doctrine that God was restrained from the exercise of the pardoning prerogative until an atonement for sin had been provided. Following in their wake, and resting upon their authority, Vorstius defended against the Heidelberg theologians the thesis of Aquinas: "*Eam Dei justitiam, quæ punitionem ob peccata exigit, à voluntate Dei pendere, sive esse effectum voluntatis ipsius, non autem essentialem Dei proprietatem.*" It was not for this that the der "Kirche."—*Die Lehre der Stellvertretenden Genugthuung, Königsberg, 1857, p. 25.*

Arminians disowned him, for Limborch, discoursing "*De Justitia Dei particulari*," declares: "*Non tenetur Deus ex vi justitiæ suæ pœnam inferre.*" He confesses it would not be *æquum*, not agreeable to divine holiness, to forgive the stubborn and contemptuous; but "*peccatores qui nondum ad istud malitiæ ac impietatis fastigium ascenderunt, non præcisè ex justitia punire tenetur; imo æquitas divina ac sanctitatis amor requirere videntur, ut resipiscentibus condonet.*" In fact, we think no Arminian can be instanced who ever grounded the necessity of an atonement upon the demands of God's retributive justice. Such a conception is incompatible with the fundamentals of the Arminian scheme.

3. "An atonement was necessary in order to the pardon of sinners on the same ground, and for the same reasons, as punishment would have been necessary if there had been no atonement made."  
—*Pres. Edwards*, p. 6.

Professor Park puts it thus: "The Atonement . . . was *necessary* on God's account, and in order to *enable* him, as a consistent ruler, to pardon any even the smallest sin, and therefore to bestow on sinners any even the smallest favor." The first of Dr. Emmons's sermons is to show that the Atonement of Christ was necessary "*entirely* on God's account," and why? Indeed, almost every writer before us has some statement affirming the necessity of an atonement, and basing that necessity on the exigencies of a moral government in which pardon was to find place.

The genius of Arminianism is, and ever has been, quite averse to the dogmatic discussion of such abstrusities as the question before us. The great men who first gave the system scientific form and articulation, possessed the modesty of true sages. They endeavored to bring back theology from the realm of scholastic metaphysics to the explicit declaration of divine revelation. They were unwilling to determine what inspiration had left undetermined. They adventured into metaphysical domains only when some practical religious interest demanded it.\* If the daring speculations of others seemed to them to endanger some evangelical truth, they hesitated not to combat it on speculative ground; but as soon as they believed the truth rescued they retreated again to plain teachings of Scripture. Hence we find far more negative determinations in the religious philosophy of the Arminians than positive. This fact is partly attributable also to the peculiar circumstances under which the system was developed.

Accordingly we do not find in the writings of the elder Arminian divines any elaborate philosophizing respecting the ground of the

\* See an admirable dissertation, "*De Philippo à Limborch Theologo*," by Abr. Des Amorie Van der Hoeven, Amsterdam, 1843. *Pars Altera*.

necessity of an atonement. We find negative determinations on the subject, as we have above shown; but positive ones seem to be lacking. Here then we note an advance. The Remonstrants of New England have taken one step not taken by the Remonstrants of the Netherlands. So much we cheerfully concede. This step, however, is exactly in the line of Arminian thinking. Properly speaking, it is simply a farther development of Arminian principles. It is true that the old Arminian divines sometimes seem to deny the necessity of any atonement whatever, in order to the extension of pardon to the transgressor; but they speak not of the *moral necessity* under which God is placed by his character as a wise and consistent moral governor, but of that inherent, constitutional, physical necessity predicated by those who taught that "God's decrees are God's essence." The "Edwardean divines" would have agreed with them in repudiating such a necessity for Christ's atoning work. The moral governmental necessity, however, they fully recognized whenever they spoke of it, only they called it "propriety," "expediency," etc. While they did not undertake to decide whether God could have safely and consistently forgiven sinners in any other way than by means of the Atonement actually made by his own Incarnate Son, they did clearly recognize the moral necessity of *some measure* by which the divine government should be secured from the effects of indiscriminate pardoning. That is, while they called in question the over-confident assertion of precedent scholastics, that no other expedient was within divine reach than that adopted, they manifestly agreed with the authors before us in declaring that *some* atonement, *some* expedient by which the divine law should be magnified and made honorable, was requisite in order to the pardon of sinners. Take Grotius, and the whole drift of his principles will be seen to be precisely in this direction.\* Punishment is for the conservation of public order, and to evince the majesty of the law. The sufferings and death of Christ served the same purpose as effectually as the eternal punishment of all transgressors would have done, hence the great Administrator was enabled to forgive a penitent transgressor without damage to his authority. The theory itself involves all that we quoted at the head of this subdivision from President Edwards and Professor Park. New

\* "Justitiae rectoris pars est, *servare leges, etiam positivas et a se latas*, quod verum esse tam in universitate libera quam in rege summo profant jurisconsulti; cui illud consequens est, ut *rectori relaxare legem talem non liceat nisi causa aliqua accedat, si non necessaria, certe sufficiens*: quae itidem recepta est a Jurisconsultis sententia. Ratio utriusque est, quod actus ferendi aut relaxandi legem non sit actus absoluti dominii, sed actus imperii, qui tendere debeat ad boni ordinis conservationem."—*De Satisfactione Christi*, cap. v, § 11.

England theologians have simply developed in a formal statement what the old Arminians took for granted.

III. *The EXTENT of the Atonement.* Did Christ die for all men or only for the elect? This was the great issue, and the only one between the Remonstrants and the contra-Remonstrants on the subject of the Atonement. They differed indeed in their respective conceptions of the nature of the Atonement, and respecting the reasons for requiring one anterior to the exercise of mercy; but these differences were not brought out, or dwelt upon, in any of the controversies which led to the final expulsion of the Arminians from their country. At the Synod of Dort there was no discussion of the character of Christ's sufferings and death, no canvassing of the different schemes of "satisfaction," not even a disagreement as to the "sufficiency" of the merit of Christ to atone for the sins of the whole world. The whole dispute turned upon this point: Did God by an immutable antecedent decree limit the benefits of Christ's Atonement to certain definitely determined individuals called the elect? The Calvinists affirmed, the Arminians denied. Have the "Edwardeans" something "new" to present on this subject? What say they?

"God designed the Atonement for all."—*Griffin*, p. 330. "The Atonement of Christ is, in a strict and proper sense, for all mankind; Christ tasted death for every man; for the non-elect as much as for the elect."—*Burge*, p. 525. "The Atonement of Christ has the same favorable aspect upon the non-elect as upon the elect."—*Emmons*, p. 119. The entire dialogue of Dr. Weeks is to prove the universality of the benefits of the Atonement. Professor Park's summation has already been given.

Here, then, we find a hearty and complete indorsement of the final characteristic feature of the Arminian theory of the Atonement. No clearer or stronger assertions of the universality of the Atonement can be culled from all the voluminous writings of Dutch Arminianism than are to be found in the volume which we are now reviewing. In many places it seems as if these "Edwardean" writers were merely translating from the dingy pages of the "*Acta et Scripta Synodalia Dordracena Ministrorum Remonstrantium*." The same proof-texts are arrayed against the doctrine of a limited atonement, the same principles of exegesis adopted, the identical objections brought up, and often in the same order; in fact, nowhere are these sturdy men so sturdily Arminian as on this point.

Dr. Griffin, it is true, endeavors to distinguish between his doctrine and that of the Remonstrants, and even to prove that the divines of the Synod of Dort were believers in a universal atone-

ment in his sense. Taking the clue from Dr. Watts, he makes an ingenious distinction between "Atonement" and "the higher ransom." The former is simply the ground of release from punishment; the latter, including the gift of the effectually working Spirit, is a gratuity conferred only upon the elect in consideration of the merit of Christ's supererogatory active obedience. Hence, when New England declares that the "Atonement" was truly designed and made for all men, and Dort declares that Christ's "meritorious death" was for the elect only, Dr. G. finds no discrepancy. One party is speaking of the lower, the other of the higher ransom.

But ingenious as this device may be, it fails to serve its author's purpose. It may account in some degree for the endless confusions and contradictions which characterize the final deliverances of the synod on the second of the Five Points; but it cannot obliterate or qualify the evident Arminianism of the "Edwardean" teachings on the extent of the Atonement. The Remonstrants treated of the Atonement precisely as Dr. G. does. They did not ask permission to teach that "*effectual calling*" was common to all men. They desired to maintain that Christ died for all, not that irresistible grace had been purchased for all or any. They even made the distinction at the time as clearly as Dr. G. could ask. In their *Declaratio Sententiae*, p. 283, they say: "The effect of Christ's propitiatory work we term the impetration of divine grace; that is, *not an actual restitution of all to a state of grace, in which, if we persevere, we shall infallibly be saved, much less a state from which it is impossible to fall*, but restitution to a state in which, justice no longer presenting any obstacle, God is both able and willing to communicate to us his benefits," etc., etc. Farther on they sum up the results of the "*reconciliatio impetrata*." They affirm that, in consequence thereof, the human family is so positioned that, 1. No man shall ever be eternally damned for Adam's sin. 2. No one of the called shall be rejected on account of sins committed before he was called, but all shall find mercy if they will only repent, believe, and lead a new life. 3. No believer shall ever perish on account of the infirmities incident to human nature; only those who contumaciously reject salvation shall be delivered up to everlasting torments. So in all the Arminian systems of divinity afterward drawn up, the occasional or external moving cause of Christ's coming into the world is invariably represented to be *peccatum* and *mors eterna*; to deliver man from these was the Redeemer's mission. The grand difference between these divines and Dr. G. is simply this: according to the former, all man needed in order to his salvation was to have the obstacles presented by justice removed; God's *essential*



benevolence would then prompt and effectuate all further measures which might be necessary; according to Dr. G., man needed to have his Redeemer do something more for him than simply to place him where the Moral Governor could forgive and bless him, and deal with him as if he had never sinned; he needed a Redeemer who should purchase and merit from the Father those positive saving influences which the Arminian divines supposed would be exerted by the Father freely, spontaneously, gratuitously. This difference, then, affects not in the slightest degree the question of a restricted or universal *atonement*. On this question we boldly reiterate our assertion, that Dr. G. and all his "Edwardean" associates are strictly, purely, simply Arminian. The *Atonement* was understood by both parties in the same sense, and both pronounce it universal.

Here then we pause. We have passed in review the teachings of the "Edwardean" divines respecting the nature of the Atonement, respecting the ground of its necessity, and respecting its extent. In every particular we have found those teachings anticipated by the great teachers of original Arminianism. The theory is purely Arminian in every part. Its advocates may complaisantly arrogate to themselves the distinguished honor of having exposed the untenableness of the old Calvinistic scheme, and of having originated a statement of the doctrine as truly "epoch-making" in its history as was the Nicene formula of the person of Christ in the history of that doctrine; but let them not turn back to the rich suggestive pages of Episcopius, Grotius, and Limborch, lest they discover the mortifying fact, that after two hundred years they have just come up to the enlightened views of the primitive Arminians. Perhaps two hundred years more may suffice to discover to them the semi-Pelagianism of some principles involved in the form of Arminianism they now hold to, and bring them to a genuine evangelical Arminianism with all its derided features. At any rate, we wish them the good fortune.

How admirable the divine Nemesis of history! The Calvinistic refugees of New England, pale, thoughtful exiles in the wilderness, have atoned vicariously for the violent expatriation of the innocent Remonstrants, adopted their once derided faith, and will not fail eventually to claim with pride those great, farsighted heroes of the Belgic Church as true pioneers and leaders of the "New School" host. How little dreamed John Robinson of this as he prepared for his grand disputation with Episcopius! What a theme for the pen of the future historian of Calvinism!

NOTE.—Since the above was written, the first numbers of a series of pamphlets, entitled "Views in New England Theology," have been issued from the press of

Messrs. Crocker & Brewster, Boston. In the first, "*The New England Theology contrasted with the New Arminianism*," the writer, understood to be Dr. Parsons Cooke, endeavors to rescue the terms "Edwardean" and "New England" from their present perverted use, by proving that the *soi-disant* Edwardean or New England Theology is radically opposed to the real views of Edwards and of the New England of olden time. Taking up the doctrine of Sin, as set forth in the unpublished but oft-copied lectures of Professor Park, he instances twenty-five points of open disagreement between Edwards and his Andover disciple, while there is but *one* point upon which they agree "half-way!" "What is here proved," he affirms, "is not a variance from Edwards on a few immaterial points. It is a difference *toto calo*, one of the most direct contradictions of Edwards's system that can be found." He takes the liberty of calling it "*New Arminianism*, not in a way of reproach, but as most according to the reality of the thing." As the author of the "Introductory Essay" in the book we have reviewed has been accused in some quarters of a little "special pleading" in said essay, in order to find his theory in the writings of the elder Edwards, we trust we may, without disrespect to any, refer our readers to this new and interesting *brochure* as an effectual corrective, if the accusation have any truth. At the same time it will be found to furnish striking confirmation of the main position of the above article, showing, as it does, that, bating some few semi-pelagian particulars, the "New Divinity" is as truly Arminian on the doctrine of sin, as on that of the atonement.

---

#### ART. IV.—OBLIGATIONS OF SOCIETY TO THE COMMON LAW.\*

WE have the authority of Cicero for saying that "nothing is truly useful which is not honest;" and it was an exhortation of the wisest of men to "buy the truth, and sell it not." Whatever is opposed to honesty and truth is an enemy to virtue and morality; and if there be any profession or calling, the practice of which tends to enervate the love of truth or the disposition to honesty, it is to be condemned and avoided. Rectitude of thought, of speech, and of conduct are the distinguishing characteristics of a virtuous and happy man; and he cannot be delighted or benefited in any employment where he may not readily cultivate those traits of character, for they are more desirable than all attainments in science.

Cato, of Utica, resolved to die when he anticipated the fallen liberties of Rome. So let even the professor of law bid his much loved science adieu, if truth and honesty, which are better sovereigns than Cæsar, can triumph no more!

The persuasion is, perhaps, not uncommon, that the science and the practice of the law are both unfriendly to the great interests of

\* Substance of a lecture delivered before the Law Department of the New York University, Nov., 1859.

truth and morality; that a great lawyer is not apt to be a good man; and that difficulties to virtue thicken in the path of him who engages in the practice of the law. Let one speak of the legal profession in connection with the pursuit of morality and religion, and he would probably be entertained with a verse from the "Loyal Garland:"

"Lay by your pleading,  
Law lies a-bleeding;  
Burn all your studies down,  
And throw away your reading!"

He would be fortunate if he escaped a facetious application of a text from St. Paul: "The strength of sin is the law." And should a father apply for a suggestion as to which of the two professions—law or medicine—it were supposed his son seemed to promise best adaptability, he need not be surprised at some such allegorical reply as this:

"One told a gentleman his son  
Should be a man-killer, and be hanged for it;  
Who after proved to be a great and rich  
Physician, and with much fame was hanged  
In picture in the university, for a grave example!  
Another schemist  
Found that a squint-eyed boy should prove  
A notable pickpurse, and after a most strong thief;  
When he grew up to be a cunning lawyer,  
And at last died a judge!"

A single remark from *La Fontaine* will illustrate the idea: "A shipwrecked voyager cast upon an unknown and, he feared, barbarous shore, presently espying a gallows erected in the distance, knew that he was in a civilized and Christian country!"

But civilized society owes to the science of the law a better respect than is thus indicated; for it is easy to maintain that the very foundations of such society would sink, and regulated communities degenerate into elements that would overthrow civilization, were it not for the invisible but potent protection of the law over society and its multiplied interests. A society of order cannot subsist without law; and were we to dispense with it we should take the perilous road to barbarism.

"Of law," says the judicious Hooker, "no less can be acknowledged than that her seat is the bosom of God; her voice is the harmony of the world; all things in heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempted from her power." Both St. Paul and Cicero affirm that *the law is the minister of God to man for good*. It is undeniably

true, that in all countries where it reigns it is a protector to the obedient and an avenger to the rebellious. Although the government which it upholds be that of Nero, it is better than none; and, notwithstanding its principles have been filtered through many forms of grossness and ignorance, still, what now remains to the civilized world is the alembic of legal purity, and is made obligatory by the sanction of heaven itself.

It has been objected as to human laws, that after they have been improved to the utmost attainable degree of perfection, they must still be imperfect in three particulars: 1. They will be defective in *substance*; 2. Weak in *motives*; and 3. Only *partial* in their operation. It is said under the first of these objections, that although law forbids crimes that are apparent and atrocious, still it cannot reach many refined irregularities which are not the less capable of troubling society for not appearing enormous or palpable. Let it be granted that it cannot ordain patience, meekness, or love, and that society without those virtues must needs be unhappy. It is said, under the second objection, that no reward for obedience to human law, nor penalty for its violation, can be sufficient to make it universally observed. Let it be granted that every violation of the law derogates from its force and authority, and that the insufficiency of its apparent motives is an evil. It is said, under the third objection, that the laws avenge us on insignificant offenders, oftentimes punishing the petty thief whom the pain of hunger or the fear of death has tempted to rob us of a paltry sum, while magnificent plunderers, wearing the plumes of conquerors, ravage kingdoms with impunity, and overwhelm whole districts with injustice and oppression. Let it be granted that the history of the world abounds with instances that illustrate the force of the objection.

But what then? Because the law cannot prescribe all moral duties, nor redress all possible wrongs, nor pervade the domain of religious obligation, is it fit that a Christian community lay it aside?

"Ubi plura nitent in carmine, non ego paucis  
Offendar maculis."

It cannot be denied that the law of nature, which has issued from the throne of infinite wisdom and goodness, is perfectly adapted to the true and lasting happiness of man; and that the precepts revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures compose a solid foundation of ethics. Now it is the boast, both of England and the United States of America, that their forms of government and systems of law are in consonance with those divine rules and precepts, and rest upon that sure foundation of the law of nature and revelation; and it is a

principle of the common law adopted by both countries that "no human laws should be suffered to contradict these."

Considering, then, the law as a rational and useful science, promotive of the interests and agreeable to the sentiments of mankind in a state of civilization and enlightenment, it may illustrate and defend our position if we find, on inquiry, that it is a science deeply imbued with the principles of true morality. Let us, therefore, attempt to trace *the moral element in legal science*, and to touch, if we can, the key-note of natural justice that harmonizes all its parts.

It is claimed for the law that it is a science of morality and justice. So much, at least, may be advanced in respect of THE COMMON LAW, as administered by the courts at Westminster, and by those in this country; for it is not only a noble edifice of antiquity, reared by the labor and adorned by the learning of centuries, but its doctrines are comprised in precepts of wisdom and justice. Its object rises as high as that of any human science, while its foundation is as strong as the immutable principles of the law of nature; and although its origin has been said to be "as undiscoverable as the head of the Nile," yet its principles, many of them of higher antiquity than memory can reach, have been recognized by successive generations as of undeniable wisdom, weight, and authority.

Borrowing its primary rules and fundamental principles from the precepts inculcated by the law of nature; from that inexhaustible reservoir of legal antiquities and lore, the Feudal system, called by Spelman the law of nations in Western Europe; from the customs of the Britons and Germans, as recorded by Cesar and Tacitus; from the codes of the northern nations of the continent; from the practical maxims of England's Saxon princes; from the ancient customs of all the divisions of Britain; from the charters of her Norman kings and those of the Plantagenet line; and from the civil law and the canon law of the Romans, the common law of England acquired at length such intrinsic excellence and general authority as to be admitted and observed throughout the realm by king and subjects, Parliament and courts, as the best rule of civil conduct. And when our own republic reared the pillars of her government, not only her federal authorities, but state after state of the confederation recognized, as embracing the most perfect system for keeping the scales of justice even and steady, the great body of the common law.

Never did a race of men advance so far in enlightenment, civilization, morality, and virtue as the Anglo-Saxon race since they were brought under the protection and blessings afforded by that great exponent of natural law.

History informs us that the Romans began to emerge from barbarism when their emperors and nobles commenced the study of the "Twelve Tables of the Decemvirs," and introduced the practice of their precepts. That part of the imperial law was regarded as the expression of the wisdom of Roman ancestors, and the study of the Twelve Tables was recommended by Cicero as equally pleasant and instructive. Said he: "They amuse the mind by the remembrance of old words and the portrait of ancient manners; they inculcate the soundest principles of government and morals; and I am not afraid to affirm that the brief composition of the Decemvirs surpasses in genuine value the libraries of Grecian philosophy."\*

But the Anglo-Saxon race did not perceptibly emerge from barbarism under the influence of Roman laws and manners. Although Britain was for centuries a province of Rome, she received but a faint tincture of Roman arts and customs. It was not until full two hundred years after the Romans retired, and indeed after the Saxons had been converted to Christianity, that the inhabitants of the island laid hold of a better polity and of higher principles of conduct, and began the foundations of that *legal system* that, more than any other science, has adorned and enriched her domains, furrowed with many keels her beautiful rivers, and spread cultivation along her fertile valleys and green hill-sides. The introduction and perpetuity of settled principles of law and justice soon cleared large tracts of country that otherwise had remained wild and unreclaimed; along the lines of forests and marshes that stretched from end to end of the kingdom, flourishing towns and other signs of civilization arose to view. Villages sent up their peaceful smoke into the evening sky, and from the church-towers pealed the softened sound of the solemn bells. A feeling of calm and security spread over the land where before disunited and unfriendly clans warred with each other like hostile tribes, or were pressed out of their native plains by marauders and invaders. A historian has said that "it is only when the curtain rises, and Alfred is discovered on the stage with his scepter and crown, that we are aware of the existence of settled principles of law, and recognize manners and customs which, without the sanction of written authority, exercised a paramount influence on the thoughts and conduct of the people. At this early period we find something like trial by jury established; the land divided into parishes and townships, and hundreds and tythings, all which are still retained, a kind of bail or mutual insurance of each other's honesty; and a rigorous administration of simple and easily comprehended laws by judges appointed by the king."

\* De Oratore, i, 43, 44.



If it be said that England's laws at that early day were but a crude and grotesque system of rules, frail as a bark upon turbulent billows, it may be answered, that bark nevertheless proved to be an ark of safety which securely bore up and preserved the nation through many storms, and even the mighty deluge of the Norman conquest, when all other systems were engulfed, until the feet of that people rested upon the broad and solid foundation of ethics and just laws, that have for centuries promoted and secured the true and substantial happiness of many generations of men. Differences may, indeed, be traced between Saxon and Norman jurisprudence; but there are features of the common law that we readily discover to be peculiar to Saxon times; though, doubtless, many essential parts of the system are of later growth. And it is a singular, perhaps a providential circumstance, that in an age when the gradual march of civilization and commerce was so little foreseen, those Saxon ancestors, deviating from the usages of neighboring nations, should impart such substance and efficacy to their legal principles as that many of them have survived the conquest of William, and infused themselves for all time into the common law.

Man is entitled to enjoy certain *absolute* rights with which he has been endowed by his Creator—life, liberty, and the possession of property. The design and end of all just laws should be to protect these rights. There are also other rights, denominated *relative*, which necessarily take up a larger space in all codes of law than do those of the former kind. But the wisest and most enlightened legislation of Christendom, while seeking to confirm and protect those absolute as well as those relative rights, has never superseded the vigorous and healthy principles of the common law. It has ever been recognized as a part of the jurisprudence of these United States, and has been the grand center around which the movements of codifiers and of law-makers have revolved. The Congress of the United Colonies in 1774 claimed it as a part of the "indubitable rights and liberties to which the respective colonies were entitled." Jurists have told us that "it fills up every interstice and occupies every space which the statute law cannot occupy;" that "its principles may be compared to the influence of the liberal arts and sciences;" that "we live in the midst of the common law; inhale it at every breath; imbibe it at every pore; meet with it when we wake and when we sleep, when we travel and when we stay at home; that it is interwoven with the very idiom that we speak, and that we cannot learn another system of laws without learning at the same time another language."

True it is that there have somehow been developed a benign influ-

ence and a sound philosophy in our system of laws. The effects of those laws prove them to be promotive of social order and happiness, as well as conducive to the growth of civil liberty; and they justify the assertion that what the wits and sages of ancient Greece and Rome did not know, and could not discover, has gleamed upon the minds of our English ancestry and those of their descendants, and tinged with unfading luster their forms of polity and their principles of jurisprudence.

In seeking to acquaint ourselves with those principles, we must go back to those ancient regulations and customs of England adopted long ago as a part of her common law, and which may be said to constitute the vigor of her lauded constitution and the security of the liberties of her people. There is *Magna Charta*, the great charter of English freedom, aptly denominated as "the keystone of English liberty," which was extorted from King John by the barons at Runnymede, and which has been confirmed in England by all succeeding generations as the bulwark of their personal and political liberty. Sir Edward Coke observed of it that "it was, for the most part, only declaratory of the principal grounds of the fundamental laws of England." An equal distribution of civil rights to all classes of freemen forms the peculiar beauty of the charter, and it has several times been directed by act of Parliament that it be allowed as a part of the common law. Then, in the reign of King Charles the First, the *Petition of Right* and other privileges of Parliament and of subjects were conceded. These were followed by the *Habeas Corpus Act*, under Charles the Second; by the *Bill of Rights* in 1688; by the *Act of Settlement* in the beginning of the next century, and by other subsequent statutes "for better securing," as they recite, "our religion, laws, and liberties—the birthright of the people of England—according to the ancient doctrine of the common law."

In these United States, by our adoption of the common law, we have secured the essence of all these rights; and, with apt words, have transplanted their principles to the more congenial soil of our free government and republican institutions. Very different is the tenor of these laws from that of the states of continental Europe, and from the genius of the much vaunted imperial laws of Rome. The latter were well adapted to perpetuate arbitrary and princely power, to the detriment of the liberties of the people; the former breathe the spirit of freedom and civil equality—of "peace on earth and good-will to man."

As the eventful drama of the history of continental Europe advances from act to act, each scene seems continually to reproduce

the wavering spectacle of oppressed and unhappy nations struggling for a better life and more perfect systems of government and laws; while over England from a long way off, we see the torch of liberty gleaming on the theater of her soil, and amid great complexity of events and frequent shifting of the scenes, that land is seen to brighten under the blended light of religion and the common law, until every spot at last grows radiant in the sublime splendor of Christian civilization.

Thus, also, as to our own country, while it is admitted that too much praise cannot be awarded to our republican forms of government and our free constitutions, which have been established and cemented by the combined wisdom and patriotism of the truest men and the most devoted assemblies the world ever saw, yet is it true that those very forms and constitutions are pervaded by the matured principles of the common law; and they infuse through all our institutions the very spirit of freedom, of justice, and morality. Under their influence civilization has here achieved her loftiest position, for where is there a land like our own on the face of the earth where Virtue so serenely walks with Law and Glory by her side?

It is said that society is formed for the protection of individuals, and states or governments are formed for the protection of society. But what shall protect a state or government when its rights are invaded by another power? There are rules and usages contained in the common law that answer the question, and that, on the important subject of international duties, have everywhere in civilized lands come to be settled as obligatory upon nations. They compose a system of laws applicable to the conduct of nations, known as the *Jus Gentium*.

In a late discussion between the Secretary of State for the United States (the late Mr. Marcy) and Lord Clarendon, the former placed his objection to some proceedings of the British government upon the recognized doctrine of the law of nations. A foreign writer thereupon observed, that "when a diplomatist quoted Vattel and the law of nations, he meant to plunge a disputed question into an unfathomable vortex of profound and conflicting authorities until the disputants lose sight of the idea which they began by discussing, and only hear the noise of the whirlpool by which it has been swallowed up." But this criticism upon national law is undeserved; for, while it must be admitted that the precepts of that law have not been comprised in any authorized code, nor its doctrines always traced with perfect precision, still its great foundation rests where that of other branches of the common law is found, upon the law of nature as discovered by man's reason, aided by divine revelation;

and the fundamental principles of international law are not only well discerned, but the due observance of them is believed to be essential to national character and to the happiness of mankind. They inculcate the practice of moderation and justice between different governments, and denounce what is contrary to humanity and morality. They accord with Aristotle in condemning those ancient practices in war of subjecting the vanquished as the property of the victor; with Sallust in declaring it *contra jus belli* for Marius, the victor in the Jugurthan war, to sell as slaves the inhabitants of a Numidian town; and with Cicero in insisting upon "the practice of the virtues of humanity, liberality, and justice" by one people toward another, because founded in the universal obligation of nature.

Those laws also protect the privileges of safe conduct and the rights of ambassadors and other public agents; they prohibit such offenses against humanity as piracy and the slave-trade, and they require proper indemnity for injuries inflicted by the citizens of one country against those under the flag or the protection of another. There are also principles of international law that regulate commerce, the navigation of adjoining seas, and the right of passage over navigable rivers by citizens of different jurisdictions. The rights and duties of nations, belligerent and neutral, in a state of war, are prescribed; and rules are defined respecting treaties, cessions of territory, and other incidents of peaceful intercourse between nations; the whole comprising recognized principles of justice and humanity, openly professed and declared by the United States of America, by Great Britain, and by the European continental powers; and which no nation can violate without being subjected to reproach and disgrace, as well as incurring the hazard of punishment to be inflicted by the injured people or its allies.

Now to characterize the well-defined and salutary regulations of this great branch of the common law, involving such important subjects, as "a vortex of unfathomable and conflicting authorities," is to lose sight of their great utility, of their moral influence, and of the probability that, but for the general recognition of those principles, unsheathed swords would be brandished by every separate nation, one against another, where now is displayed the olive-branch of peace.

With regard to those rules which every political commonwealth in England and this country has found it necessary to enforce, for the protection and well-being of society and of individuals—the *jus civile* of states—the common law presents its masterpiece. It is the chief municipal law of those countries. It holds immediate relation to the good order of society, the morality of the community,

and the happiness of man. Diversified as are the interests of communities and of individuals, the whole are under the guardianship of this invisible but powerful protector. It secures to every man, the humblest citizen equally with the highest, the enjoyment of his personal security, his personal liberty, and his private property. All the natural and absolute rights of individuals are held in its safe-keeping. It, moreover, regulates and protects all their relative rights, whether public or private. Magistrates, whether supreme or subordinate; people, whether natives or aliens; officials, whether legislative or executive, civil or military; the domestic relations; bodies politic; rights concerning property; crimes and their punishment, are severally embraced in this branch of the common law, which is defined as "a rule of civil conduct prescribed by the supreme power in a state, commanding what is right and prohibiting what is wrong." The words of Demosthenes may also be added: "It is proclaimed as a general ordinance, equal and impartial to all."

If the great body of the common law, combined with the statutes of our land, touching, as they do, the dearest relations and the most cherished interests, were not pervaded by the principles of natural justice, equity, and morality, they would never have received for so long a time the unwavering homage and respect of all classes of citizens. The wise and the good would have contemned them, and the vicious have trampled them under foot. Intelligent men would have found some more delightful employment than the devotion of years to the study of such a science. Mental cultivation would have sought out other channels of progress to the neglect of that found in the law. The competency of the human faculties to discover the truth on all matters within the range of their conception would not have failed in this particular; and there would not have been wanting many minds of sufficient daring to exhort the people to throw off the oppressive yoke of servitude to an unjust and debasing system.

But, in the history of the human race, no better system of law than our own ever ruled the conduct of men. We look back through ages of oppression, and over lands blasted by injustice and tyranny, and turn again to our own time and country with rational joy. We have embraced and continued to hold fast the grand principles of morality, of equity, and of justice, that have been eliminated from other systems and adopted into the common law; and, breathing upon them the spirit of our free institutions, have harmonized them to a completer fitness to the wants of humanity; so that there is no system of laws so perfect as that which now gives method and

direction to the complicated affairs of the greatest nation of freemen that ever lived !

The enforcement of law by one man over another, or by one class of officials—the judges—over other men, is the greatest exercise of superiority tolerated in a free country. The judge utters from the bench but a few words, yet they are fraught with the greatest consequence. If that utterance respect the estates of suitors before the tribunal of that judge, those estates are secured to the possession or pass from the enjoyment of the claimant. If they respect the life or liberty of the trembling culprit at the bar, those potent words set him free, or they immure him in prison walls or swing him from a gibbet. Yet the province of the judge is only *jus discere*, and not *jus dare*. He cannot add one jot or tittle to what has been already written, and his judgment must rest on acknowledged maxims or established principles. Never was there power of such importance wielded by human hands in this confederacy, that was distinguished by a loftier morality or more incorruptible integrity, than that of our judiciary. From the infancy of the republic to the present day, it has held the scales of justice even and steady. It has presided over the complicated affairs of society with consummate ability and rectitude. The weak have never been too insignificant to invoke and receive its aid, nor the mighty too powerful to avert its mandates of justice. We are informed that the Jewish lawgiver was renowned for being learned in the wisdom of the Egyptians, and that ancient Egypt, by some mysterious art, subsisted in much glory during a period of fifteen or sixteen centuries. One secret of that art is disclosed, while we read of a justice so impartial that their kings obliged the judges to take an oath that they would never do anything against their own consciences, though they, the kings themselves, should command them. With a like impartiality and rectitude our own judges have been distinguished. Their decisions have been regarded as expositions of equity and morality, and so consonant with justice as to secure unwavering respect and obedience. But the rules that have guided their judgments and illuminated their opinions are those golden-linked principles of law that have been worked out by the genius and illustrated by the learning of the world's great masters of ethical lore. So that it cannot be said of our free republic that "Themis stands by the throne of Alexander to stamp with right and justice whatever he does;" but the supremacy of the law and the independence of the judiciary are powers that rise above the highest official or personal influence, and shine, like the sun, with equal effulgence upon all.

It is because the common law which we have adopted is general



in its application, and contains that organic arrangement and excellence which blends substantial justice with all the forms of its administration, while regulating civil rights, that it is regarded as the great protector of individual interests and the conservator of civil liberty. A late writer on civil government has remarked, that if we had not brought here the common law, "and should have brought from England all else, and had adopted the civil law, our liberty would have had a very precarious existence." And it is related of the elder Adams, when Blount's conspiracy was before the Senate, and the question whether the common law was to be adopted was discussed, he exclaimed "that if he had ever imagined that the common law had not by the Revolution become the law of the United States under the new government, he never would have drawn his sword in the contest." So dear to him—a great lawyer—were the privileges which that system recognized and enforced. In this land of freedom we live in the enjoyment of those liberties, secured to us by law, which Algernon Sidney referred to when he said, "The liberties of nations are from God and nature, not from kings;" for our federal and state polity, and our system of laws, are well adapted, not to protect kings or to pamper aristocracies, but to secure society, the domestic relations, and the rights of individuals. One of the most cherished of these individual privileges is the primordial right of liberty of conscience; for the genius of our laws wisely dictates that conscience lies beyond the reach of government or the power of prelate or law-maker. Here, therefore, every citizen is at liberty to pursue his own true and substantial happiness, restrained only by those checks which are found to be the necessary guarantees of that individual liberty, and which, as all experience shows, conduce to the best interests of order, morality, and justice.

In the full enjoyment of the greatest blessings that heaven has ever bestowed upon any people, the Anglo-Saxon race are pursuing their brilliant career. Upon their extended empires the sun never sets. All abroad throughout their vast domains order, peace, and security reign. Whitening fields, burdened with ripening grain, lie unmolested, until their owners gather in their rich harvests. The law stands like a sentinel over that unprotected treasure, and watches it still when in storehouse and barn. From the ports of great cities all manner of naval structures depart with precious freights, and return again laden with the products of distant lands. Over the lonely pathways of ocean and along the thronged piers of the metropolis those cargoes are safe and they who own them. Those cities themselves, that seem like Babels, have no habitation whose very boundaries are not guarded, and whose inmates are not protected by the

law. It is there, as everywhere, a shield to the innocent and an avenger of the wronged. Science and art, invention and industry, bring forth their contributions to the general good, and are sure of their rewards. Religion rears her temples without restraint, and dedicates them for all time to the service of the one living and true God. Civilization puts on a new light, and seems fast approaching the reflection of heavenly things. Christianity holds on her bright and widening way, and when the impartial historian shall hereafter from his serene throne trace the causes that led that wonderful race up the stupendous heights of their brilliant culture, intelligence, morality, and freedom, chief among the sources of their greatness will be marked the wisdom and beneficence of their systems of law. And while that historian, touching the people of these United States, shall speak of their national greatness and security, their civil liberty, and the tranquillity of their society; of the protection afforded among them to private rights; of the increase and diffusion among them of intelligence and wealth, and of the manly tone of their moral sentiment and energy, he will admit that these were the grand elements moved and influenced by their forms of polity and their principles of law; and that the definite standards of right which those principles established, coinciding with the dictates of Christianity, taught them, as a people, to ascend from the grosser inducements of natural inclination to that rectitude and morality which have exalted the American nation to the highest rank of the civilized world.

---

ART. V.—ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT AND HIS COSMOS.

*Cosmos*: a Sketch of a Physical Description of the Universe. By ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT. Translated from the German by E. C. OTTE, B. H. PAUL, and W. S. DALLAS. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1850-1859.

THE conflict between natural science and the Christian faith is waning. Meeting on the basis of a compromise obtained on the one hand by a corrected Scripture philology, and on the other by an abatement of some scientific pretensions and conclusions which had been carried too far, particularly in geology, these two are now found to be essentially in unison. The one is a complement of the other; each wrong in excluding, and only just to itself in affirming the other. Faith can lend to science its sweet trust and hopes, and science in return can give its clear insight and its truths to faith, and both thus find their appropriate place and function in the life of

.

.

the individual no less than in institutions. This concord is the outgrowth of two ideas, which are to-day too firmly established in the Christian consciousness ever to be other than important factors in existing as well as all future culture. One of these ideas is, that nature and revelation, or God in his works and in his word, must harmonize, and hence, that the purely scientific conclusions of the one, fairly though independently reached, must be in accord with a fair interpretation of the other. The second idea is, that the world was made for man; in which, still further, two things are implied: first, that all the uses of nature are servants of man's physical, intellectual, and moral needs; secondly, that it is mainly by means of the mathematical and physical sciences that man is to pass from his present severe bondage to the labor of supplying his natural necessities, up to that lordship of nature which the steady progress of science and the useful arts now assure us of as the fulfillment of the primal command given to the race at the beginning, to subdue the world and have dominion over it. In this view, physics and theology touch each sympathetically in the sphere of the religious life, which as ever, and to-day more than ever, serves itself from the empiric sciences.

Humboldt was the representative man of the age in the department of the natural sciences. He was empiricist and philosopher in one. He loved the solid facts; from them he strove to read the law, and then to ground both law and fact in some higher, more comprehensive unity of law or fact. He was unsurpassed for careful, thorough observation, power of combination, range of scholarship, a keen faculty for noting resemblances and differences; which qualifications place him beyond all question as a representative man in natural science, whose business is with matter in its forms and laws, and not with its genesis nor with the moral and religious aspects of natural truths. Analytic, like Aristotle and Bacon, he tends to the individual, the phenomenal, and develops the ideas in them; then, sympathetically and poetically, he seeks from them to build up an organic whole; not reconstructing nature as the rational cosmologists have been trying to do, with only small success as yet, but describing nature in its own coherence, transcribing it according to the chapters and subdivisions found written in itself. He studied nature after the method of Bacon, but was far superior to him in scholarship, and in the reach and precision of his investigations. From Thales to Leibnitz, and later still, facts have often been used as a sort of spring-board for mental gymnastics, as an arena for a metaphysical pirouetting. Theories of the world-formation, and of the on-goings of nature, have been constructed from a narrow basis

of facts, or from the mere insight of the reason, which in their logical manipulation have fallen into the grotesque or false, of which abundant examples he who wishes can find in the old philosophies lying dead and useless now, like philosophic fossils of ideal worlds. We have no intent to disturb these, only referring to them at the suggestion of the contrast between some deformed, half-mythic ancestor, and the robust, promising child of modern thought, the Cosmos.

Throughout his long life Humboldt was the child of a rare good fortune. His eminent position in science was partly due to the accidents of noble birth, wealth, court patronage, and influential friends. That great men, as the world calls them, are the creatures of circumstances, are the product of other than native-born forces, is but the complement of the truth that men are makers of their own fortunes. No enthusiasm nor iron will can wholly dispense with the aid of circumstances. These make and mar, push and postpone: in the poetic symbolism of the Greeks they were blessed gods. It is he who is planted on the "rim of the rising tide" that is borne to the highest success. For Humboldt there was a concert of propitious circumstances such as rarely falls to the lot of any individual; the most favored of mortals in science since the days of Aristotle, with whom he shares the honor of having admiring friends, kings, and kingdoms as tributary to the enriching of themselves, and of the world through them.

Alexander Von Humboldt was born in Berlin, September 14, 1769, a year often noted as memorable for the birth of quite a constellation of distinguished men, among whom were Cuvier, Canning, Wellington, and Napoleon, whose biographies form a large part of the science, literature, politics, and military history of the last seventy years. Wealth and social position freed his childhood from want and toil, and surrounded him with the means and incitements to scholarship; parental care kept him from the baser vices of youth; men eminent alike for their fine qualities of head and heart and scholarship were the teachers of his boyhood. The fine social influences of Berlin were all at his command. Campe, the translator of Robinson Crusoe, apart from the routine of text-books, fed the imagination of the growing boy with romances of foreign travel. A Doctor Heim taught him botany, according to Linnæus. Some years later he outgrew and then refashioned that science of Latin names. So, fortunately for himself, for the world, for his fame, his pursuit of knowledge was made under the rarest facilities. He is said in early life to have acquired so slowly, in comparison with his brother William, that at one time both mother and teacher

despaired of his success as a student. His after life, so splendid in results, suggests, not the old fable of tortoise and hare, but the fact of sturdy labor transmuting itself into genius. In the University at Gottingen, his good star, as usual, in the ascendant, he enjoyed the personal intercourse among others of Blumenbach, famous in natural history, of Heyne, the archæologist, Eichhorn, the historian, and George Forster, a companion of the ill-fated Captain Cook, a bold, versatile, and brilliant man, and of much influence on him in favor of the natural rights of man. At the University his side studies were mainly in natural history. In 1792, having been appointed director of the mines in Franconia, he threw himself with his wonted energy into the study of the plants in the neighborhood, to experimenting in chemistry, metallurgy, and to writing for scientific journals. Such a young man could not dawdle away his time over the sentimentalism of the Sorrows of Werther, or lounge in the day and debauch at night. To him it would have seemed lost time to build "Chateaux in Spain." He must be prying into the organic structure of plants, into geology, chemistry, reforming the methods of mining, brooding over the laws of nature and winning her secrets from her, and devising schemes of foreign travel. The serene stars, cloud-mountains in the sky, a grove, a waterfall, tropic palms, and mountain flowers, and all the forms of majesty and beauty in nature intoxicated him. Nature has a potion for her lovers that exhilarates beyond the influence of any wine that ever came from the belly of grapes, that gives an ecstasy second only to that of the trances of Socrates, Behmen, and other "dreamers," who nevertheless in their dreams lived a more real life than if they had digged for gold, or made a fortune by speculating in stocks. His burning passion to see strange lands was gratified by the five years' journey (1799-1804) to South and Central America and the United States. He traveled in company with Aimé Bonpland, a distinguished naturalist. The rich fruits of this journey appeared in a noble edition of twenty-eight volumes, accompanied by maps and engravings, in bringing which before the public the best French and German artistic and scholarly talent were employed for many years. It would have been suggestive of human progress to have placed this colossal work side by side with the crack publications of the Augustan age of Roman literature, and still more richly suggestive to have examined their contents. Still the work was too heavy for general use; "in ponderous continuity, but with diminishing celerity, folio after folio, quarto after quarto, dropped from the press." Labor was his habit, a second and improved nature. Take a brief summary of his and Bonpland's labors in that five years' journey. They analyzed the

air on mountains, in valleys, and perilous craters; made numberless geological, astronomic, barometric, and magnetic observations; determined and corrected altitudes and geographical distances; mapped localities and the course of rivers; examined mines, volcanoes, and the tracks of earthquake shocks; botanized; gathered geologic and other specimens, and grammars of the native languages; studied and recorded the antiquities, habits, customs, agriculture, trades, language, history, politics, and physiology of the nations they visited. Of their endurance of hunger, cold, heat, and toil, of dangers from savage beasts and still more savage men, they do not complain, and we take no account.

Such great and varied collections had never before been brought into Europe from foreign lands. Humboldt took up his abode in Paris in order the more successfully to work out the results of that and other short journeys, by aid of men eminent in the sciences, who at that time were to be found in Paris. Of like beneficial results, particularly in the establishment of magnetic observatories in Europe, Asia, and Australia, was the journey to the Ural and Altai Mountains in 1829. On his return in 1830 he fixed his residence at Berlin, at the urgent solicitation of the Prussian government, which was proud of him and jealous of his living in other countries. After this he made occasional scientific, literary, political, and semi-political visits to divers persons and places, and in 1843 began to write the *Cosmos*, which was finished in 1858. This work is a *resumé* of the progress of the natural sciences, the net result of his own scientific labors, extending beyond a period of seventy years; years of the world most noted for the cultivation of science, literature, and all the various forms of industrial and scientific activity. The work is also the praiseworthy and magnificent endeavor to describe the universe as a harmoniously ordered whole, to bring its manifold diversity of phenomena under the unity of general laws. It was intended as a legacy, and by the author's death has become as it were the last will and testament of the author to man in general, and to the German nation in particular.

*Cosmos* is a happily chosen word for the title of the work, and it bristles with suggestions of labor and learning and æsthetics. It has a history, and Humboldt gives it; for he is not averse to an etymological search, knowing that a single word is sometimes a historic gem, a social picture, the food as well as the vehicle of thought. Eastward in the old Sanscrit it appears as the "purified;" westward among the Hellenes as an "adornment," "order," "rhetorical ornament." With Pythagoras it was the "order in the universe," the "universe" itself, the "totality of all things" in heaven and earth



as displaying order and beauty. The use of the word comes of a fine æsthetic instinct. A grasp of the solid facts is good, tends to breadth of base, to a solidity of foundation: but the intuitive flash of the direct insight of the reason is good also; is the grand fore-reaching toward the things yet to come; is the sudden soul-sally going out through long reaches of thought, and apprehending truths it would take the slow-footed, matter-of-fact induction long periods of time to arrive at. Who taught our ruder ancestors that through this measureless diversity of phenomena ran interweaving threads that bound them up into a concrete unity; that multiplicity was only variety in unity; that the all was one? Yet, back as far as the records go, it was the firm faith of the best minds. It came from the intuitions, and Humboldt, too catholic to deny the value of any form of mental activity, makes concessions to idealism that border on mysticism. Humboldt shakes hands with Boehme, the prince of mystics. He says: "The recognition of the unity of the Cosmos began in an *intuitive presentiment*, and with merely a few actual observations on the isolated portions of the domain of nature." "To the primitive intuitions may be traced an exuberance of figurative language, and some of the best chosen symbols of the happy inspiration of the earlier ages are still preserved among our scientific terms." "The presentient fancy of Plato, Columbus, and Kepler must not be disregarded as inefficient in the domain of science, or as necessarily withdrawing the mind from the investigation of the actual." But Humboldt goes no farther; avers this ground to be too insecure to tread on with safety; that the results are perilous abstractions, and hence he confines himself strictly to empirical investigations. The higher range of the speculative reason, all explanation of nature *a priori*, are resolutely excluded, and beyond the range of physical phenomena and historic facts he does not go. But he was the master mind of his age within this range; he was unrivaled in his knowledge of works on science, of the physical structure of the earth, of the solar and sidereal systems, of comets, of nebulae, of the interconnection of the sciences, and, as a worshiper of nature, more thoroughly Greek than a Greek himself.

A history of the labors tending directly and indirectly to the development of cosmical views is a history of science itself, and which, in points not a few, laps over upon the history of philosophy and literature. Many of the records of this history lie, fossillike, in the old literatures and languages; others glimmer like stray points of light near the sources of human knowledge; and yet others have perished with the civilizations and ages that produced them. But a science is not born in a day. The myth of Minerva, the goddess

of the sciences, springing in full size and panoply from the brain of Jove, is an offspring of Greek ignorance and fancy. But a fact once established follows the law of endless circulation; does not abide alone. Even the roving marauders on land and sea in the olden times, as well as men of learning, enlarged the boundaries of knowledge, and thus connected Humboldt with mythic Cadmus and Jason, the Vikings and Columbus. This physical history of the universe has a twofold interest: the one scientific, the other arising from the fact that the same races grouped around the basin of the Mediterranean sea, the same historic events, the spread of the same languages and literatures, and the same culture, prepared alike for the establishment of cosmical truths and Gospel doctrines, for a knowledge of a universe and of its Creator. In a series of graphic pictures Humboldt depicts this progressive history, and we reproduce them in part.

The Chaldeans and Egyptians, given to star-gazing, to speculation and practical mathematics, advanced astronomy. The Phœnicians, by their colonies, their commerce, their starlight navigation, and their alphabetic characters, widen the domain of knowledge. The old Etrurians, by their meteorological records and divination of nature, gave to the Romans a bias to physical inquiries. The restless Greeks, fond of adventure and greedy of gold, pushing eastward through the Bosphorus to the Crimea, westward beyond the memorable gates of the Mediterranean, and everywhere along the shores of this storied inland sea, planting colonies, singing the songs of Homer, and, under the leadership of the impetuous Macedonian, bringing with them from the remote East an enlarged knowledge of climate, geography, plants, older and other civilizations and astro-nomic knowledge, work to the same end. The reigns of the first three Ptolemies made Egypt notable for its criticism and learning, which was a fortunate exchange, at that time, of the graceful, imaginative Attic writers for those encyclopedic scholars who began to compare and generalize on the accumulated facts and truths of past generations. Then came the colossal empire of the Romans, by which the partition walls among the tribes and races grouped around that basin of the Mediterranean were broken down, and the Roman dominion, incorporating into itself the varied treasures of Grecian culture, the influences that had come from the valley of the Nile, from Judea, Phœnicia, the Euphrates, and India, formed the positive groundwork on which has been reared the hierarchy of the modern sciences, splendid even in its incompleteness, and far fuller of faithful promises than performance. The Ishmaelitish Arabs next take their place in the advancement of cosmical knowledge. This

was a wonderful race of men. After centuries of seclusion they suddenly overran, like wildfire, the older civilizations of the East and the West. With but little school culture, yet with great natural ability; mobile and flexible, yet clannish and meditative; devoted to alchemy, magic, and mystical fancies; lovers of nature and repose, yet wild, fierce, and sensual; clear-eyed, devout, and much given to ceremonial, and with a strong faith and feeling for the invisible, these Arabs came in contact with more cultivated nations, and there was quickly kindled within them a love of letters that soon made them, for a season, the greatest depositors and distributors of the learning of the West. They subdued the nations between the Atlantic and the Indus, had commercial relations with Northern Europe, Eastern Africa, India, and China; diffused languages; introduced the Indian numerals, arithmetic, and algebraic analysis; studied art, and enlarged the knowledge of geography, mechanics, pure mathematics, and natural history; enlarged upon the labors of ancient and cotemporaneous scholars of the three continents. They were the inaugurators of a new era in chemistry, and the creators of modern pharmacy and *materia medica*, which grew out of their practice of preparing the aromatic and balsamic products as staples of commerce, and which, on the one hand, led to the study of chemistry in the twofold form of analysis and composition, and, on the other, to modern botany. The Arabs form an important link between modern and ancient culture, and prepared for later and still more brilliant advances in the experimental sciences and cosmical views.

Results never dreamed of came from the varied pursuits of men. The love of adventure and the spirit of romance, which give a dash of heroism and a tinge of beauty to the monotonous drudgery of human toil, now prompted the bold oceanic discoveries and voyages of the Portuguese, Spanish, and English, which added a vast mass of new ideas in regard to the unity and varieties of the race, the migration of nations, plants, animals, cause of the trade and periodical winds, variations of temperature on land and sea, volcanic and magnetic action, and the thousandfold play of the forces of nature that weave in ceaseless activity this wonderful garment of the Unseen. All these, with the progress in nautical astronomy and naval architecture, the use of the compass, the log, the chronometer, soon opened up to man a knowledge of nearly all the world, and stretched the lines of a varied, busy, and rapid intercourse over all lands. Then came some noted historic characters in the last of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries: Galileo; Kepler and his three famous harmonic laws of planetary motion;

Descartes, who used the algebraic analysis in solving questions in geometry, and thus was pioneer in the mathematical path that opened out into brilliant achievements that surpass the fabled wonders of Aladdin's lamp; Newton and the theory of gravitation, and the Calculus; Tycho Brahe, the foremost man of his age in astronomical observations. Also that artificial, far-seeing organ of vision, the telescope, which, by the aid of a new faculty, as it were, the wonder-working Calculus, brought the starry heavens within the domain of scientific statements as precise as the doctrines of conic sections.

Thus the domain of positive science was extended, and a connection more or less clear and broad was established amid the changeful, ceaseless flow of the vast sea of phenomena. This idea of the unity of the universe has ever been a pleasing fancy to thoughtful minds. It must have been an intoxicating thought to him who first named it the universe—all facts *turned into one*. The unity of nature is a splendid pictorial vision of the living processes of nature, grander even than the Mosaic one of creation. Trace for a moment one of the lines of connection that run through the diversity and multiplicity of nature. Take botany, and it rays out through all the spheres of knowledge. The distribution of plants is a question of climate, and climate touches on meteorology, on the figure of the earth and its daily and annual revolutions, on solar influence and action, and these in their turn on astronomy, and thus on distant stars and erratic comets. Again, the nourishment of plants is a question of chemistry, and chemical analysis has developed a relationship between air, and soil, and plant, and, reaching still further, touches on the mineral kingdom; this on geology, and geology has its bearings on the past history and present condition of the globe as the superbly furnished abode of man, and adapted to his physical structure and mental constitution. The ability to trace this relationship is one of the trophies won from nature by the patient, wrestling toil of many generations.

Humboldt has done much for science, both by direct contribution and the stimulus and aid given to others. He may be regarded as the founder of Comparative Climatology, or Isothermalism, which holds such an important place in physical geography. In his hands botany expanded into a botanical geography, and gained a cosmical interest from the distribution of the plants according to climate and the altitude above the sea. To geology he was no mean contributor. As a traveler he was the first of his age, a second Columbus following in the footsteps of the first, and opening upon a new continent, a new world of phenomena, races, and languages. His contributions

to geography itself were equally great with the change he wrought in the mode of its presentation by giving those graphic and pictorial illustrations of the chief features of land and sea, and of generalized facts, and of complex physical phenomena, by which means the pupil obtains a far more ready, correct, and lasting view of the same than by the old method. He is neither jealous nor ostentatious. He is glad to expedite his labors by the aid of others, and then acknowledges the aid in the most generous terms; gives materials and advice for works to others, and allows them to reap the benefit and repute of the same. He is a thorough Teuton. He is subjective enough to warrant the saying that the Germans rule the air, and his marked objectiveness is likewise a national trait that expresses itself in the German's love for landed property and material interests. He loved truth, and had the old Teutonic persistence; was veracious and simple, and hated liars and rogues. His reflective powers were large, and he would have been an ideologist, a transcendentalist of the first water, had not the practical and scientific bias in him held him to other national peculiarities, a love of detail and an adherence to facts. He might have speculated grandly, but he kept close to results. He aimed at universality on the material side of knowledge, and his success was a wonder of his age. A cardinal virtue of his was the patient, painstaking labor that makes no haste either with the spoken word or printed book. He was a scholar, and the scholar has the function of the brain, is the intellect standing at the center to co-ordinate the outlying, the erratic, the seemingly lawless, to gather facts and transmute them into truths. He was poetic, giving an investiture of grace to plain, bare truths; such grace or charm as obtains in nature, where beauty and mathematics are blended into one. In natural sciences he was a patriarch; was free from bad passions, meanness, stubborn prejudice, and partisan aims, which are as damaging to the scholarly function as heresy and immorality are to the clerical. The following is a condensed picture of him taken in Berlin.\* In spite of his eighty-one years he works unweariedly in those hours which are free from court duties; he is active, punctual, and affable in his immense correspondence; walks with a slow, firm step, a thoughtful head slightly bent forward, either looking down or returning polite salutations to friends; his face beaming with kindness and no sign of pride in it; in a simple dress, sometimes with his hand behind his back and a pamphlet in it. The people honor him as much as they do the king, and in public treat him with marked esteem; they yield the walk to him and say to each other, "There goes Humboldt." He loved generous actions and

\* *Lives of Alexander and William Von Humboldt*, p. 145.

romantic scenery; he could appreciate a description of nature whether in Hebrew psalm, Greek pastoral, Roman idyl, or Indian hymn. The wind and clouds, the southern cross and tropic palm had an attractive charm for him. He loved this wondrous world passionately and tenderly as a mother loves her child. We must place the works and influence of Humboldt among those providential dispensations which directly further the welfare of humanity. Touch these works on what side you may and you strike upon some great question of human interest.

We do not feel ourselves competent to sit in authoritative judgment on such a work as the *Cosmos*, which treats of the history, processes, and results of the different branches of natural science in a masterly manner, that has secured for it a translation into the languages of most of the civilized nations. The *Cosmos* is a physical description of the universe. The author himself indicates the scope and object of the same. "Beginning with the depths of space and the regions of remotest nebulae, we will gradually descend through the starry zone to which our solar system belongs to our terrestrial spheroid circled by air and ocean, there to direct our attention to its form, its temperature, and magnetic tension, and to consider the fullness of organic life unfolding itself upon its surface, beneath the vivifying influence of light." This will be done so as "to include the realms of infinity no less than the minute microscopic animal and vegetable organisms which exist in standing waters and on the weather-beaten surface of our rocks.\* . . . And here we have been able to arrange these phenomena according to partially known laws; but other laws of a more mysterious nature rule the higher spheres of the organic world, in which is comprised the human species in all its varied conformation, its creative intellectual power, and the languages to which it has given existence. A physical delineation of nature terminates at the point where the sphere of intellect begins and a new world of mind is opened to our view. It marks the limit, but does not pass it."†

A few words on the relation of the *Cosmos* as the representative of the physical sciences to the Gospel. The former has even its truths independently of the Scriptures, and for this reason its testimony in favor of the doctrines of the Bible is the stronger for being undesigned and independent. We demand intellect and we demand morality; we reverence the saints and honor the savans. But then science is subordinate to the moral sentiment; knowledge is in order to life; knowledge is worthy of pursuit both for its own delight and for the guidance it gives to the moral conduct, and in

\* Vol. i, p. 80.

† Vol. i, p. 359.



this way the sage shall serve the saint. The doctrine of a personal God is not stated in the *Cosmos*. In fact, that and kindred questions lay outside of his self-imposed task, and in the present state of our knowledge we think the exclusion not at all detrimental to the interests of religion and positively beneficial to science, which, if not warped by prejudice or passion, will always bear convincing testimony to the goodness and wisdom of the Creator.

The oneness of all nature, the harmony of the universe, declare the unity of the Creator. From a survey of the material universe, whether in the waving leaves of plants, in the fossil flora and fauna, those somber records of bygone ages, or in the clusters of the cosmical islands with their suns and circling planets wheeling silently around some unknown center, we find everywhere the footsteps of the same. In the remotest regions pierced by the telescope, the same law of attraction, the same method of revolution, the same light, hold sway. This unity denies the existence of rival Gods. Moreover, there is no warring, hostile dualism of God and matter; that pagan and patristic error, with its twin children of a harsh asceticism and licentious antinomianism, has fled forever from the lands blessed by science truthfully so called. As positively as the words of Jewish or Christian Scripture, science proclaims a monotheism. A clear-eyed unprejudiced science sees no rival deities in the universe; one system of order harmonizes its widest differences, and finds, or is destined to find, some copula for its sharpest antitheses and seeming discords, and is becoming more and more "the analysis of the thoughts of the Creator of the universe . . . and in tracing them the human mind is only translating into human language the divine thoughts expressed in nature in living realities." Again, to those who will go behind the facts to discover the idea, the principle, or the drift of them, so to speak, the harmony of the universe is a lesson of progress, and is at one with the prophecies of Hebrew prophet and Christian apostle. For this harmony is not only an adjustment of the present forces and forms, but also a succession of related facts. In the successive ages between the various organic and inorganic forms of matter, there have been connections and correspondences enough to be the grains of truth in the infidel development hypothesis of the notorious *Vestiges of Creation*. And so "along the shores of old oceans that roll no more," in the changes of the earth's crust and atmosphere, in the organism from the mollusc up to man, and in the dispensations of the sciences themselves, we read a law of progress, a law not from evil to good, but from good to better. From the past and present we may range into the future; and from the fragmentary curves of discovered purposes, even if

broken to the dim vision of sinful man, we may sketch the orbit of the ages yet to come. Not the sameness of the circle, but the ascending, widening sweep of the spiral, is the fit symbol of the ongoing of nature. The divine wisdom has "in a certain manner tied the evidences of religion to the wheel of man's endeavor,"\* and he is best trained to defend his faith who takes lessons from the teachings of the blow-pipe, the telescope, geometry, geology, and zoology, as well as history and Scripture.

Moreover, science has demonstrated the stability of this ever-moving universe. The aberrations of the heavenly bodies are self-correcting; stars do not cross the track of stars; planets do not fall outward into space nor inward to their suns; the ecliptics do not slip down to the equatorial circle, although they rock backward and forward through myriads of years; and so the succession of the seed-time and harvest, and the variety of the days, are not changed into a weary monotonous sameness of all seasons and days. Science reads us lessons in unison with the yearnings of the hopeful, and with the wishes of the good and the convictions of the rational. Besides, they sadly err who think and say that the exact sciences chill the poetic feelings or clip the wings of the imagination. The soothing charms of nature are lost by no empiric process or mathematical reduction. Poetry and mathematics are not contradictory, but anti-thetic only. The stars of heaven, seen by the eye of science making their great revolutions without haste and without rest, and with a periodic precision that baffles the detection of a second's discrepancy in a thousand years, spring nobler thoughts and give more fire to the imagination than ever came from Greek or Roman constellations of Bear or Dragon, with all their mythic fancies. The deductions of science in regard to life stir the soul, and nourish it to a richer poetic bloom than can possibly come to it from any mythic or fanciful similitude of life. We cannot always reduce the play of the life-forces to geometric lines and figures; the growth of the corn and the blooming of clover are not questions in our mathematics; yet the interplay of precision and provision with the unknown and the infinite gives a satisfaction and a pleasure to the mind of man of the noblest kind. The imaginative pleasures of precise scientific knowledge far transcend those of ignorance and indefiniteness.

We are introverted; we must busy and bother ourselves with questions of duty and destiny. We are like ships on the stormy sea, drifted often by unknown currents, driven by winds and tossed by waves, and are ever on the look-out to hail some passing ship to tell us whence we came, where we are, and to what port we are

\* Cardinal Wiseman on Science and Revealed Religion.

bound? Hence the pertinency of questioning all facts, all science, if perchance they can help us solve some of the riddles of human life that infect our thoughts. The immortality of the soul touches on the question of a plurality of habitable worlds; the resurrection of the body on chemistry; the compensations and methods of nature on the doctrine of future punishment and reward; the successive periods of the world-life as revealed by geology and zoology, pointing the finger to times when species and forms began to be, pointing to places where the line of genealogy is abruptly ended, suggest a power above nature, and so justify miracles. The relationship between facts of science and human destiny is too intimate to limit all investigation to mere empiricism.

A serious charge has been brought against the Cosmos, that of Atheism, or Pantheism, which are the same heresy seen from different standpoints. The charge is a gratuitous one. The object of the work being a physical description of the universe, and lying as it does in the domain of empiricism; being the record of external facts, their generalizations and their genesis within material nature itself, the questions concerning the being of God and the destiny of man are only indirectly connected with it, only supervene upon it. The geometry that hides in nature reveals the divine intelligence, but yet we do not censure Euclid for not passing over from strict science to natural theology. And hence for Humboldt limiting himself purposely to empirical investigations, to what lay within the grasp of the senses, not beyond them, we have no word of reproach, though we have feelings of regret that that clear, steady eye was not directed to man's spiritual relations as well as his physical ones. But æsthetic grace and the majesty and universality of natural law are the burden of his teachings. And if he sums up the forces operating in nature and in morals as effects of some *primordial necessity*, yet this same necessity can be counted as an equivalent for secondary causes which need have no taint of Atheism about them.

The Cosmos professes to be simply a picture of nature, a delineation of things sensible; avoids inquiry into primal causes and final ends; it treats of the material, and disclaims, not the existence, but the investigation of the intellectual sphere. From silence we cannot affirm a denial, and hence the error of those who, infidel themselves, claim Humboldt as one of their class. They say of the Cosmos that the name of God does not occur; that it shows that all belief in a personal Creator, a self-conscious Ruler of the universe, all looking toward immortality, all supersensual forces, not provable by the senses or by inductive logic, or that do not lie clear to the eye of experience, must be shoved aside as childish crudities or

hoary errors by man, who is his own supreme law to himself. We simply but emphatically deny these inferences. They are ignoble assumptions, falsely wrested from the text, and those who do it seem like men pushed to desperate extremities for arguments and seeking to entrench themselves behind a great name. The fact is, there is no attempt, open or secret, to establish or to refute religious truths. If any inferences can be justly drawn they lie on the other side, as one whose name carries weight with it justly says in regard to phenomena and their cause :

"When in our pride of philosophy we thought we were investigating systems of science, and classifying creation by the force of our reason, have we followed only and reproduced, in our imperfect expressions, the plan whose foundations were laid in the dawn of creation, and the development of which we are laboriously studying, thinking, as we put together and arrange our fragmentary knowledge, that we are anew introducing order into chaos? Is this order the result of the exertions of human skill and ingenuity, or is it inherent in the objects themselves, so that the intelligent student of natural history is led unconsciously by the study of the animal kingdom itself to these conclusions, the great divisions under which he arranges animals being indeed but the headings to the chapters of the great book he is reading? To me it appears indisputable that this order and arrangement of our studies are based upon the natural primitive relations of animal life; these systems to which we have given the names of the great leaders of our science who first proposed them being in truth but translations into human language of the thoughts of the Creator. And if this is indeed so, do we not find in this adaptability of the human intellect to the facts of creation, by which we become instinctively and unconsciously the translators of the thoughts of God, the most conclusive proof of our affinity with the divine mind, and is not this intellectual and spiritual connection with the Almighty worthy our of deepest consideration?"\*

Life is too short to excel in all departments of knowledge. There will be a deficiency somewhere. Humboldt dwarfs himself on the ideal side in order to develop a completeness on the material one. But this dwarfing is found in all devotees of a special department of knowledge as well as in the mad riders of one idea. When as a natural philosopher Humboldt shuts his eyes to the brighter side of natural truths, ignores the tracing of the lines of science making their perfect curve in the moral world, dropping his pen or closing his sentence when the current of his thoughts verges toward questions touching the whence, the where, and the whither of this mysterious life, we feel that he has made a sad mistake, but a personal rather than a literary one. He loved beauty, but that love stirred but a faint pulse-beat in the moral life; he loved the truth, but truth relating to the connections of nature and not to the lessons of a divine benignity, wisdom, and love, scattered broadcast over nature. As an appendix or introduction, as suggestions or thoughts "between the lines," a word might have been added respecting the

\* Essay on Classification, Agassiz.

religious nature and destiny of man; and if he could consistently give a hundred pages to the influence of nature on the feelings and imagination, as he has done, he need not so strictly have avoided giving a single line on the teachings of nature in regard to a supreme Ordainer, from whom has come the plan of creation, which plan is clearly not the result of physical laws. But he chose his field of labor, confined himself of set purpose strictly to empirical investigations, worked in it with unprecedented success and with a world-wide enduring benefit to many, and we make no complaint; do not even blame him; for into the sweet fields of idealism, into the noble sphere of theology, others have entered and will yet enter and gather the abundant harvests, for which Humboldt himself has sown the seeds of truth with no sparing hand. He wished to be regarded as a teacher of natural science, nothing more. We accept him gladly, thankfully, as such, and render him our hearty thanks for a long life's contributions to our stock of empiric knowledge. But then, on the other hand, since he does not recognize the spiritual amid the glories and wonders of nature, we respectfully bid him step aside as a subordinate to the perfect teacher, one who has, in addition to his other qualities, the "upward-looking aspect of mind which is the crowning gift of all," and which seeks "the Deity in his manifestations."

There is one historic personage between whom and Humboldt there are certain points of likeness. We introduce the parallel partly to set forth more clearly the characteristics of Humboldt, and partly to recall attention to that part of the *Cosmos* omitted by him, namely, the universe as a manifestation of all-comprehensive mind and all-impulsive heart. The majority of mankind will confess to Humboldt's deficiency as the perfect philosopher of nature, so long as they believe in a personal God who is the source of life and happiness, and believe that matter, nature, truth, and emotion, or the world, knowledge, and life, are not to be violently sundered into hostile antagonisms, but are to be joined in a sacred union in which the spiritual shall dominate the sensuous. We refer to Emanuel Swedenborg; but to Swedenborg as a man of science, and not, be it remembered, as a theologic seer, for there were, so to speak, two Swedenborgs: the later or theologic one supervened upon the earlier or scientific one in the fifty-fourth year of life. Humboldt and Swedenborg were descended from good families, and stood in intimate, confidential relations to royalty; both had the same republican proclivities, were advocates of the legal equality and brotherhood of all the races of men; both were students from childhood, devoted mainly to the study of the mathematical and natural sciences; both were superintendents of mines, and wrote and pub-

lished works of value on metals and mines, works still held in high esteem; both were notable scientific travelers; both had a practical genius. Humboldt could give suggestions for growing fine grapes, and Swedenborg for improvements in stoves; both disliked the purely metaphysical method and used the solid inductive one in investigation; both systematized rather than collected facts; both stood head and shoulders above their native cotemporaries in the vast breadth of their scholarship, which took in solar attraction and chemic forces, the circulation of the blood, and the revolution of suns and planets, and from the force-currents of a bit of magnetized iron they could surmise the planetary forces and orbits; both accepted the universality of the laws of nature, and taught that the movements of nature, even in their most graceful, fluent forms, are at bottom as mathematically precise as the rebound of a ball or the variations of algebraic equations; both were untiring drivers of the pen for more than threescore years, were "Captains of the heroes of the Writing Desk;" both were grandly careless of mere artistic effect in their style of writing; both were simple in dress, unassuming, modest, kind-hearted, eminently gentlemanly in deportment and catholic in feelings; both gathered slowly but comprehended broadly and remembered tenaciously; both were bachelors living in unostentatious style; both were poetic by nature, and at times blended the imaginative and the scientific in the written thought, which seemed a union of grace and truth. Both pass from external facts into the domain of the emotional, where nature by its reflex action moves the feelings, kindles the poetic impulses, and prompts those intellectual creations of wonder, grace, beauty, and terror that pervade and overarch the whole of our natural life, as testify Greek statuary, the Gothic arch, the poetic sides of science and literature and art. But here Humboldt stops. Swedenborg passes alone into the region of faith, where appear the moral bearings and religious uses of science, where the Cosmos seems more than facts, and physical laws seem a revelation of intelligence and goodness; where philosophy and science are merged into life, where the intellect serves the moral sentiment, where the Deity is sought from his works. It is more for the spirit and aim of Swedenborg's dealing with science than for the net results that we value him, and we prefer an occasional stepping from the material to the spiritual with the Swedish seer to an abiding amid the former with the German sage.

The world divides its teachers and thinkers into two classes, the materialists and the idealists. The materialist believes in houses and lands, in external history, the senses as the sole source of



knowledge, the universe as matter regulated by fixed discoverable laws, and the ministry of material uses, such as social wants, bread, freedom from oppressive toil, as the final causes of science. But the idealist affirms that the spiritual and material import of a fact are the reverse and obverse sides of the same; that nature is symbolic as well as servile, and her facts are significant of beauty and goodness as well as of utility. He sees an intellect through the geometry of the heavens, in the harmony of chemical proportion; a supernatural ordainer in the order in the universe; a moral governor in the moral, social, and individual compensations; a divine goodness and beauty in the abundant blessings and profuse beauty of the world. Flowers reduced to their ultimate classification so as to exhibit their relation to soil and climate, and the connection between root, stem, and flower for an instructive lesson; but when, from the idealist point of view, the great teacher teaches the goodness of the Creator and the loveliness and certitude of human trust, who does not see that it is a lesson of nature transcending that of simple empiricism?

"Consider the lilies of the field how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin; and yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass . . . shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith? Therefore, take no thought, saying, What shall we eat?" etc. The words *wherefore* and *therefore* emphasize this didactic use of nature. The whole passage is one of the finest instances we know of, illustrating how the insight of the reason is a minister to the devotional, trustful feelings of the soul, and leads to a serene faith which men ever require unless they have done violence to some of the noblest aspirations of our common nature. He has firmest hold of the feelings and thoughts of the world who is a minister of the ideal and the real in common. The Mystics even are a useful class, serving higher uses than grinding corn or grading railroads, inasmuch as they give to facts and principles, which the empiricist has exhausted and left, the higher æsthetic charm, the poetic uses and moral significance, which alone will prevent this wonderful, complicated universe from appearing as a mere congeries of material forms, as a piece of godless mechanism.

Where physical nature ends Humboldt pauses. A laborious life of near a century and no rise to the higher planes of thought, no answer to the demands of a first philosophy, no heed to the immortal longings of the soul. We still wait for the Christian philosopher, the true expounder of a universe which discloses "premeditation prior to the act of creation," and which, as it contains the thoughts

of the Deity, must yield to man, created in his image, lessons of life suited to an heir of immortality.

We said that the contest between faith and science was waning. It is even so. But this has been brought about by reconciling the two, not by the triumph of one over the other. It must be the same henceforth. We have no fears of the results of any scientific investigations. All scientific truths may be wrought into the experience of a perfect life, of a life that is rounded out according to God's ultimate idea of manhood. The astronomer will resolve nebulae, weigh worlds, and bring the starry hosts within the domain of mechanics, without regard to Scripture statements. So let him work. The geologist will examine the great stone book, and translate therefrom the records of extinct organisms, and bring to light relics and memorials and forms of bygone ages, without regard to the book of Genesis. So let him work. The chemist will analyze and recombine matter with no eye for proofs of anything outside of his sphere of labor. So let him work. The ethnologist will study the varieties of the race in the forms of the skull and facial angles, in their anatomy, color, and hair, without regard to the Scripture doctrine of the unity of the race. A Layard exhumes Nineveh without seeking to confirm Jewish history. So let them work. For in the end all the lines of separate inquiry will ray inward to the same center, will establish, explain, or illustrate Bible truths. We think the duty of the clergy as the spiritual guides of men is clear: it is to welcome the truths of science in the spirit of a genial recognition of the laborers in science, as co-workers with them to the same end, namely, the glory of the Creator and the wellbeing of the creature. For it is in nature that we trace the fresh footprints of the Deity; in nature, fluent or solid, hide his precious thoughts, and man is the interpreter of the same. The times have changed and we must change with them. About Arius and Athanasius, primitive Millenarianism and Monasticism, it is well to study in connection with Christian doctrines; but the preacher of to-day should no less con well the lessons of the telescope, the microscope, the blowpipe, and the crucible, for just here are now some of the most gifted intellects of our race working with an enthusiasm and a reward unknown before. Here too lies the conflict with the infidel tendencies of the age. The smoke of the old metaphysical battles has well-nigh rolled away. It was the ring of the geologist's hammer that recently summoned to a contest on another field, that of the physical sciences. Yet even here the oneness of nature and revelation will be so shown as to increase man's confidence in the power, wisdom, and goodness of a God who is One. The physical sciences are radiant with promises of good cheer to man.

## ART. VI.—THE PARSEES.

*The Parsees*, their History, Manners, Customs, and Religion. By DOSABHOY FRAMJEE. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1858.

*Parsisme*. By M. MICHEL NICOLAS. *Revue Germanique*.

*Mazdeisme*. By M. HAUG. Two articles in *Revue Contemporaine*.

THOUGH few in number, the Parsees possess an interest for the Christian scholar surpassing that of any Oriental nation except the chosen people of God. Under the various names of Magians, Guebres, Gebirs, and Parsees, they have maintained a distinct national existence, a peculiar national creed, and a system of religious worship, varying in a marked degree from the nations by which they were surrounded, from a period prior to the birth of Abraham to the present day.

They are not, and never have been, as a people, idolaters. No idols have ever defiled their temples, no sacrifices have ever stained their altars. They have been stigmatized for ages as fire-worshippers, but they have always indignantly repudiated the charge, and we believe with truth, except, perhaps, in the case of the most ignorant among them. They preserve indeed what they call the sacred fire in their temples, but so did the Jews. They offer no sacrifices to it, but burn incense lighted from it in their temples. Their own account of this worship is, that they regard fire and the sun as special symbols, by which Ormuzd, the supreme being, manifests his good-will and beneficence toward men, and hence they are to be regarded as sacred, but not to be considered as objects of worship, or to be addressed as existences. As a people, the Parsees have been acknowledged, even by their enemies, in all ages, to be virtuous, chaste, brave, regardful of the rights of others, and eminently good citizens.

A people who have thus maintained their integrity for four thousand years have a claim to be better known and understood by Christian nations; and it is with a satisfaction in which we are certain our readers will participate, that we present a brief sketch of their history, their religious views, and their present condition, drawn from recent works published by themselves, and from the testimony of those who have long resided among them, and whose eminent scholarship, not less than their thorough familiarity with the Parsee customs and worship, qualifies them to be competent witnesses on the subject.

The descendants of Shem who settled in Persia and Media seem

to have retained, with less admixture of error than other nations, the traditions which, through the patriarch Noah, had been preserved of the Supreme Being who had placed our first parents in Eden, and of the tempter whose machinations drove them thence. These traditions were carefully preserved by a class called *MAGI*, or wise men, who, though not officiating in all cases as priests, yet possessed, by common consent, an authority analogous to that of the priests of other nations. For some centuries these wise men maintained the primal traditions nearly or quite in their original purity, and through their high reputation as the guardians of the antediluvian traditions exerted a powerful influence on the adjacent nations. Long ages after the sensual inhabitants of the plain of Shinar had reared altars and offered human sacrifices to deities which personated their greed, their violence, and their lust, the grave sages of Iran adored only the holy and all-powerful Ormuzd, who made his sun to rise alike upon the evil and the good. But human nature is corrupt and prone to fall, and the time came when the Persian sages lapsed from the purity of their worship, and though perhaps never falling into absolute idolatry, yet dealt in incantations and talismans against the powers of evil, and probably even sought by some homage to avert the wrath of Ahriman, whom by this time they had exalted into a being of malignant nature, and of almost equal power with Ormuzd. Ages passed on, and the pure faith of the early Magi seemed destined to fade from the memory of the inhabitants of Iran; but at length a reformer arose, Zurtosht or Zartusht by name, (the Zoroaster of the Greeks,) and sought to restore the purity of the early Persian worship. The period of Zurtosht's career is not satisfactorily settled. Some have supposed that there were several of the name, and that the acts of these had all been attributed to one. This theory took its rise from the supposed fact that the last of the name, the Zoroaster of the Greeks, was cotemporary with Darius Hystaspes, who ascended the throne B. C. 521. This idea gained plausibility from the apparent coincidence of the name of Gushtasp (the monarch often spoken of in the fragments of Zurtosht's books still extant) with Darius's surname of Hystaspes. So strong a proof of their identity did this seem that many of the Parsees of India, whose traditions were broken by their exile, and who possess but fragments of the sacred books, had adopted it. Recent explorations in Media, however, have brought to light inscriptions and tablets which materially conflict with this view, and indicate that the Gushtasp of the Zend-Avasta was, as the internal evidence of the work itself would seem to demonstrate, a monarch of much earlier date. The portions of the Zend-Avasta

now extant are addressed to a pastoral and agricultural people, not highly civilized, and not congregated in large towns; yet, for some centuries prior to the time of Darius Hystaspes, a large portion of the Persian population had been dwellers in cities, and they were among the foremost nations of the East in civilization and refinement. For these and other reasons M. Nicolas, whose article on this subject in the *Revue Germanique* gives evidence of profound research, is inclined to place the advent of Zurtocht 1100 years earlier, or about 1600 B. C., thus making him a cotemporary of Moses.

Zurtocht was born, according to the Persian traditions, at Rai or Raghai, in Media. His father's name was Poroshusp, and his mother's Doghdo or Daghdā. An angel, it is stated by his biographers, with the true Oriental love for the supernatural, presented to Poroshusp a glass of wine, and the conception of Zurtocht followed. At his birth the counselors of the governor of the province, jealous of the honor conferred on Poroshusp by the angel, prompted their master to destroy the child, but the efforts made for this purpose failed. During the childhood of the future reformer these same malignant counselors sought his destruction many times. Once he was cast into a blazing fire, but escaped unscathed; once he was exposed in a narrow passage to be trampled to death by a herd of half-wild oxen, but they carefully turned aside; repeatedly was he thrown in the way of wolves and other wild beasts of the forest, but always was preserved from their fury.

On attaining his thirtieth year he left his native town and came with his family to the Persian capital. Here for ten years he remained in seclusion and devoted himself to the study of the earliest traditions of the Magi, and to the effort to comprehend as fully as mortal might the character and will of Ormuzd. At the expiration of this period he presented himself at the court of Gushtasp, bearing in one hand the sacred fire, and in the other a cypress twig, and demanded audience of the monarch. When the king inquired who he was and why he came thus before him, Zurtocht announced himself as the prophet of Ormuzd, who had been sent to teach him and his people the path of truth, virtue, and piety. Gushtasp and his courtiers at first ridiculed and persecuted the prophet, but the miracles he wrought convinced them, and ere long the monarch gave the weight of his influence in favor of the reformed religion, and two of his highest officers, Furshorter, his prime minister, and Jamosp, the wisest of his counselors, became its most active propagandists.

His doctrines thus received, Zurtocht desired to perpetuate them.

and brought forward as a divine revelation the fruit of his ten years' study and meditation. He gave to this collection of twenty-one volumes, which was at once a system of cosmogony, theology, doctrine, ritual, and litany, the name of *Avasta*; and as it was written in the *Zend*, the ancient language of the Persians, a language prior even to the Sanscrit, it was called the *Zend-Avasta*. Of this work there are now extant but three volumes, and fragments of four or five others. So far as can be judged from these portions, it would seem to have been a compilation of the earliest and most reliable traditions of the Magi, with a cosmogony and ritual of Zartosht's own invention. His royal patron received the work as a divine revelation, and immediately took measures for its diffusion throughout his realm. Twelve thousand hides were, by his orders, converted into parchment for its transcription, and numerous scribes employed in copying it. Nor was Gushtasp's zeal satisfied with its propagation throughout his own dominions. Missionaries were sent to other lands to proclaim the doctrines of the *Zend-Avasta*; and before Zartosht's death it was professed by most of the adjacent nations, and had even penetrated into India. One stout-hearted king, however, Arjasp, the ruler of Turan, opposed its introduction into his realm, and persecuted bitterly its adherents. Exasperated perhaps by his obstinacy and hostility, Zartosht departed from his hitherto peaceful policy and persuaded his royal patron to declare war against the infidel king. The war thus commenced was protracted through many years, and victory inclined alternately to either side. At one time Arjasp won several battles, and seemed to have so nearly conquered the followers of the prophet that he made extensive preparations for a massacre of all the believers in the *Zend-Avasta*; but the scale soon turned, and at length thoroughly subdued, he and his people yielded to the king of Iran and professed their belief in the doctrines they had so long opposed. During this long and sanguinary war Zartosht died, or, as some say, was murdered by the Turanians. He had reached the age of seventy-six years.

The *Zend-Avasta* continued to be the religious standard and oracle of the Parsees down to the time of Alexander the Great, who conquered Persia and destroyed many of the sacred books. That these doctrines were prevalent in the time of Darius the Mede (Cyaxares II.) and of Cyrus, who assumed that name, signifying the *SUN*, at the time of his accession to the throne, will be admitted by every attentive reader of the sacred or profane history which records the deeds of these two monarchs.

The attempt of Alexander to destroy the copies of the *Zend-*



Avasta in circulation among the people, that he might introduce the Greek mythology and hero-worship was followed, a century or two later, by a more persistent effort on the part of the idolatrous Arabs, who ravaged the country to obtain and burn every copy of the sacred books in existence. They succeeded but too well; for eighteen hundred years no complete copy has been known to exist; and though fragments remained, and the more pious of the Persians sought to retain and transmit by oral traditions the religion of their fathers, yet numberless corruptions had crept in, and in the first two centuries of the Christian era these monotheists of twenty centuries seemed fast lapsing into idolatry, just as the other nations of Western Asia were rousing themselves to shake it off.

It was at this period, 226 A. D., that a wise and pious prince, Ardeshir Babekan, ascended the throne, and almost at the commencement of his reign sought to restore to his country the faith of their forefathers. He assembled all the learned men and priests of the empire, more than forty thousand in number, it is said, to consult together upon the best means of restoring the ancient purity of their national religion. From this vast concourse a body of wise and learned men were selected, who chose the most eminent of their number for piety and learning, *Ardai Veraf*, to prepare a volume, which they critically examined and approved. This work, ARDAI-VERAF-NAMAH, (the revelations of Ar dai Veraf,) bears a considerable general resemblance to the *Divina Commedia* of Dante. It is a vision of the future condition of men, both the good and the evil, and in its conversations presents most of the distinguishing doctrines of the Zend-Avasta. It is still extant, and though not regarded by the Parsees as one of their sacred books, has exerted a powerful influence over their religious history.

In the latter part of the seventh century of the Christian era the Parsees, defeated and overwhelmed by the Saracens, who would tolerate no faith which did not acknowledge the divine mission of Mohammed, emigrated in great numbers to India, and located themselves in Sanjan and other portions of Guzerat. Industrious and frugal, and treated with kindness by the Hindu rajahs, they became during the next seven or eight centuries a wealthy and powerful people, adhering strictly to their traditions and not adopting the Hindu idolatries or worship. Toward the close of the fifteenth century the Mohammedans undertook the subjugation of Guzerat, but found formidable enemies in the Parsees, from whose minds eight centuries had not sufficed to efface the wrongs inflicted by the followers of Islam on their ancestors. The Hindus, too, resisted the Mohammedan invaders, but in the bloody conflict which followed

the Parsees were ever in the van, and bore the brunt of the terrible slaughter with which their enemies signalized their triumphs. For a long time the contest was doubtful, but at length the Parsee leader was slain and the allied troops gave way, pursued closely in their flight by the bloodthirsty disciples of the prophet. Defeated but not discouraged, the surviving Parsees again exiled themselves from their homes and emigrated to Bombay and Surat, where they now form a large portion of the population. Mr. Framjee, one of themselves, estimates their present number at about one hundred and fifty thousand, and five or six thousand are still found in Persia. The testimony of the East India Company's officers, and the officials of the British government in India, to the high character of the Parsees for integrity, morality, and devotion to the interests of the government under which they live, is uniform. They are regarded as the best native citizens in India, and are to a very considerable extent its bankers. Within a few years past they have made decided progress in female education, and in their matrimonial laws. They have also taken religious instruction, to a considerable extent, out of the hands of the Mobedo or hereditary priests, who are generally ignorant, and confided it to intelligent and devout laymen. In liberality to every deserving object of charity the Parsees have set a noble example to Christian nations. Their wealthy men have been very generally distinguished for benevolence. One of them, Sir Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy, who deceased the past year, contributed to public objects of charity more than \$1,500,000, and a considerably larger amount in private acts of beneficence.

Having thus given the religious history of this remarkable people, we proceed to give a brief sketch of their theological system, and our readers will, we think, find in it not only traces of the Semitic traditions and the legends of Eden, but evidence that more than once its Magi and reformers had come in contact with the revelations of Hebrew prophets, and possibly also with the New Testament Scriptures.

The Supreme Being, creator of heaven and earth, is Ormuzd. Far back in the ages of eternity he created seven spirits who should stand before his throne, and have rule over the phenomena of nature and the subsequent creations of his hand. These seven spirits were called *Amschaspands*. Chief of them all in glory, dignity, and power, was *Ahriman*; and next to him *Bahman*, *Ardebehescht*, *Schariver*, *Stapandomad*, *Khordad*, and *Amerdad*. *Ahriman*, stimulated by pride and ambition, sought the throne of the universe, and failing in this rebelled, leading with him in his revolt many of the inferior spirits. Thenceforth he became the power of evil.

Next in rank to the Amschaspands came the *Izeds*, twenty-four or twenty-eight in number. These seem to have been personifications of the powers of nature favorable to man. Below these were the *Fravaschis* or *Ferusic*, angelic beings and disembodied spirits of men, and perhaps of animals also.

When Ahriman had revolted from his allegiance to the Supreme Being, Ormuzd, for his own glory, set apart a period of twelve thousand years, during which Ahriman might be free and exercise his power. This æon or cycle was divided into four sub-periods of three thousand years each: during the first of which Ormuzd reigned supreme and completed his work of creation; during the second the contest began between Ahriman and himself; in the third the two parties to the conflict were to have, apparently, equal power; and in the fourth, which is now progressing, Ahriman has for a time the predominance, but in the final struggle is to be subdued and punished.

Ahriman, like Ormuzd, has surrounded himself with six chief spirits, who are as active in plotting evil as the Amschaspands in promoting good. Besides these, he has under his control a host of inferior malevolent spirits, to whom the general name of *Devs* or *Dævas* is given: among these the *Dronkhs* carry off the bodies of the dead, the *Yatus* are enchanters, the *Pareikas* (the *Peris* of the Persians) are maidens of wonderful beauty who entice men to evil, the *Koyas* strike their victims with blindness, and the *Karafnas* with deafness. The *Devs* seem to be the impersonation of vices, impurities, and all noxious things.

During the first period of three thousand years after the revolt of Ahriman, Ormuzd created the sky, the sun, moon, and stars. He then made the fire, the wind, and the clouds; separated the solid part of the earth from the waters, bade the mountains raise up their heads, and planted among them *Albordj*, the father of the mountains, from which the sun and moon each start on their respective journeys. He next created the vegetable world, and first *Hom*, the type of all trees. He then formed *Abudad*, the great bull, from whose blood all the living things on the earth have sprung.

By this time Ahriman was ready to enter upon the contest. He first slew *Abudad*, but his body became the germ of all animals and of the first man, *Kajamorz*. The *Devs*, at Ahriman's command, slew him also; but Ormuzd caused the plant *Reivas* to grow out of his body, and at the end of fifteen years it matured, and bore as fruit fifteen pairs of human beings, the first of whom were *Meshia* and *Meshiana*, the parents of the present race. After each act of creation Ormuzd rested and celebrated the festival *Gahunbar*.

Ahriman, finding himself foiled in his efforts to destroy the human race at the beginning, changed his tactics, and sought by his own influence and that of his *Devs* to seduce them from their allegiance to Ormuzd. In this effort he has been but too successful. Ormuzd requires of all human beings three things: *Homute*, *hookhte*, and *vorusté*, purity of speech, purity of action, and purity of thought. These requirements, to men enticed to wickedness by the temptations of the *Devs*, which fall in with the evil propensities of each, seem a hard matter, and many fall and are lost. When death comes there is a struggle for three days between the *Feruers* and the *Devs* for the possession of the deceased. At the end of that time, if the soul is pure, a fair and beautiful maiden comes and leads the disembodied spirit away to the land of the blest; but if it has yielded to the temptations of Ahriman, a hideous hag appears, who hurries it to the place of torment. At the end of the world, the bodies of the dead will be raised and united with their spirits.

At the expiration of the twelve thousand years Sosiosh or Caosh-yane, the promised redeemer, shall come, annihilate the power of the *Devs*, awaken the dead, and sit in final judgment upon spirits and men. Immediately after this the comet *Gurzsher* will be thrown down and the world will be destroyed by fire. The remains of the earth will then sink down into *Duzakh* (hell) and become, for thirty-six thousand years, a place of punishment for the wicked. The just who may be living upon the earth at the time of its destruction, will pass through this fiery ordeal unscathed, and enter upon their inheritance of blessedness in a new heaven, *Govodmone*, and a new earth, created for them by Ormuzd. At the expiration of the thirty-six thousand years, Ormuzd will have compassion on the wicked and will pardon their sins, and admit into heaven those who seek it by penitence and prayer. After a still longer period of suffering and purification, Ahriman himself, and the spirits who accompanied him in his rebellion, will give evidence of their penitence and be admitted into heaven, where they will chant the praises of Ormuzd.

The Parsee worship consists of reading portions of the *Zend-Avasta*, (the language of which, however, is understood by very few,) adoring the sacred fire as a symbol of Ormuzd, sprinkling themselves with consecrated water, praying to Ormuzd and the good spirits, and partaking together of bread and wine.

They are very strict in regard to ceremonial uncleanness, especially that induced by touching a dead body. The defilement resulting from this can only be removed by a long process of purification. When a Parsee dies, his body is borne at the end of three

days to the *tower of silence* (a lofty building erected on a hill or terrace) and placed on a grating near the top of the tower, which is open. The flesh is plucked from the bones by birds of prey and insects, and the bones fall after a time into a receptacle beneath, whence they are taken and placed in a suitable shrine.

A people whose religious traditions approach thus nearly to those of the ancient people of God, and among whom the feeling of the necessity of personal holiness and purity is yet a living principle, cannot be far from the kingdom of God. Their very morality may indeed, like that of the young ruler in the Gospel, for a time prevent their hearty and willing reception of salvation through Christ; but we cannot doubt that God has purposes of mercy toward a race so wonderfully preserved from idolatry, and that ere long the Parsees will be among the trophies of Immanuel, and, by their intellect, influence, and wealth, prove the most successful propagandists of Christianity among the nations of India. May he hasten the time.

---

#### ART. VII.—THE DIVINE-HUMAN PERSON OF CHRIST.

THE scope of our investigation, to harmonize with the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ his true humanity, does not require us to demonstrate the former; we take it for granted. Nor do we consider it necessary to examine in detail the testimony of the New Testament concerning the true humanity of the Son of God. This also is granted on all sides. The impression which the Evangelists make upon us is evidently this, that the birth and life of Jesus was really and truly human. Born of a woman, in the entire helplessness of an ordinary child, he increased both in years and in wisdom. In keeping with the laws of our physical life, he felt hungry, was tired, etc. In the same manner his physical life appears as really human; he feels grief and joy, indignation and pity, etc.

It is evident that the New Testament represents Jesus both as a true man and very God; it must also be conceded that humanity and divinity are not predicated of Christ as existing in him side by side of each other, as if the humanity and the divinity in Jesus were two separable, though closely connected, constituent parts of him, or as if the God-man Jesus Christ was a compound being consisting of a God and a man. The whole New Testament speaks only of one Christ, the incarnate Son of God, the incarnate Logos that was in the beginning with God and that was God, God manifested in

the flesh. For this reason the Christian Church has at all times taught that Jesus, uniting in himself two natures, the divine and the human, was in one person very God and very man, equal to the Father according to his Godhead, like unto us according to his humanity in all things, sin excepted.

But to this union of two opposite natures in one person, such as are the divine and the human, it is objected, that it *involves not only a mystery that transcends human reason, but something self-contradictory and therefore impossible*. "God," it is said, "is eternal and infinite, man is created and finite; the Eternal One cannot be conceived as born in the course of time. Again, God is omnipresent, omniscient, and omnipotent, while man is impotent and limited, both as to his being and knowledge. God is supremely blessed, absolutely independent, and governing all things; while man is capable of suffering and dependent. How can, then, one and the same person be eternal and created, omnipresent and finite, omnipotent and limited in power, omniscient and lacking in knowledge, uninterruptedly happy and suffering, at the same time?"

In such a juxtaposition these predicates appear indeed irreconcilable. But *supposing* the matter to be as represented, our inability to reconcile them would be no valid reason why we should doubt their union in Jesus Christ. The proofs of true divinity and true humanity in Christ are not less convincing and irrefutable, if we cannot understand the manner in which God and man are one in him. *Our very inability to understand this now forbids us to look upon the fact itself as something self-contradictory*. The historical phenomenon of Jesus Christ is rationally inexplicable, except we ascribe to him divinity proper and true humanity. We are therefore not justifiable to deny either of these predicates because we cannot comprehend the manner of their union. Even the science of mathematics must recognize a manifest contradiction in the proposition that two lines may for ever approximate toward each other without ever meeting! To purely immaterial beings, as the angels, the existence of a being that is composed of spirit and matter, that is mortal and at the same time immortal, such as man is, might possibly appear as self-contradictory as does to the skeptic the union of divinity and humanity in the person of Jesus Christ. Even to ourselves the union of body and soul is incomprehensible, and infinitely more incomprehensible is to us the Divine Being; how can we then presume to affirm that the union of divinity and humanity in one person is self-contradictory and impossible? Where is the proof that it was impossible for the eternal Son of God to have, in addition to his eternal divine form of existence, also



the human form of existence in time? where the proof that the Godman Jesus Christ cannot be, at the same time, both in time and eternity? Is it not peculiar to God's dealings to reconcile opposites? Think, for example, of the opposites, divine grace and human liberty. Why should our faith in what God has revealed and abundantly confirmed unto us be shaken, owing to our ignorance of what he has not revealed unto us? He has revealed and confirmed unto us the fact, that in Jesus Christ the Godhead dwells bodily, without explaining unto us *how* this is the case. Our concern is merely with the question, What is Christ? not with the question, How was God in the man Jesus? The answer to this question is beyond human comprehension. It is too deep for us; we cannot fathom it. There is nothing analogous by which it could be explained; it is an object of faith. The philosophy of the fact we must leave with God.

We have thus far proceeded on the supposition that the incarnation of the Son of God might really involve a contradiction that our reason cannot solve. But before we can admit this supposition it is our duty to examine closely whether the teachings of the New Testament on the incarnation of the Son of God really involve the contradiction in question, or, in other words, whether the New Testament places the attributes of divinity and humanity so side by side to each other that this contradiction results therefrom. If we should find after a close examination that this is not the case, but that the teachings of the New Testament on the person of Jesus Christ solve, or rather, do not involve the contradiction as stated above, it is certainly the duty of Christian theology to express the fundamental doctrine of the Gospel in terms which do not involve a seeming contradiction. The evangelical theology of Germany, in the struggle against the remnants of rationalism, which denies the divinity proper of Jesus Christ, has felt herself called upon to endeavor to harmonize with the divinity of the Redeemer his real humanity, or the really human development of his life which is so expressly taught by the evangelists, in order to gain thereby a proper conception of the person of the God-man. Dr. Dorner, the author of the "*Entwicklungs-Geschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi*,"—"History of the Development of the Doctrine concerning the Person of Christ," says on this point: "In the long conflict between Christianity and philosophy, it is a matter of congratulation that *that* point is gradually coming to be universally and distinctly understood, which is of the very first importance if the controversy is ever to be decided. All the energies of the two conflicting parties are collecting themselves more and more around the person of Christ, as the central point where the matter must be

determined; and this is a great advance toward an adjustment of the hard strife, for when the question is rightly put the answer is already half found. It is also easy to see that, in this case, everything depends upon the question, whether there need have been, and really has existed, such a Christ as we find in the confession of the Church; that is, a being in whom the personal and perfect union of divinity and humanity is truly consummated and historically made manifest. For if we suppose on the one hand that philosophy could incontrovertibly prove that the person of Christ, in this sense, is a self-contradicting notion, and therefore an impossibility, there would then no longer be any conflict between Christian theology and philosophy. With the overthrow of this doctrine, Christian theology and the Christian Church would cease to have an existence in any legitimate sense of the word Christian, as with the capitulation of the metropolis the whole land falls to the enemy. And, on the other hand, if the idea of a Christ who is both human and divine can be proved on philosophical grounds to be rational and necessary, then it is equally clear that philosophy and theology would be essentially reconciled with each other, and would ever after have a common labor, or rather would have really become one; and philosophy would then not have lost, but strengthened its claims to existence. Hence, in the great battle which is being fought between the greatest powers in the world, Christianity and philosophy, it is well for both parties that the contest should center more and more around the point where alone all is to be won and all is to be lost."

Dr. Liebner, another theologian that has become renowned through his Christological writings, says: "The question: What do you think of Christ, whose son is he? has become again in its full force the cardinal question of theology; theologians become pre-eminently Christologians; the stone which the (theological) builders had rejected has again in reality become the corner. And there arises again for our age, with peculiar adaptedness for apologetical purposes, that grand and majestic train of Christological truths, from the center of which all is seen in true evangelical fullness and in the proper evangelical order up to the doctrine concerning the triune and only true God, and down to every question connected with Christian ethics. And what here comes to light is, to say it in a few words, the system of all systems, that system which is destined by its inalienable birthright to subdue all other systems. The ancient Church has in sanctified and gigantic speculations laid the foundation; the Church of every succeeding period, when alive to her calling, has continued her efforts in the same direction, and its completion will require the efforts of the Church to the end of

days. It is the system of the eternal divine thoughts that are laid down in the facts of Revelation, and have been actualized most distinctly in Christ, the only begotten Son, and which are reproduced by the believer, who by a living faith has received these facts within himself. We shall grow in the knowledge of Jesus Christ as *the truth*, in whom all riches of wisdom and knowledge are hid, and shall learn to understand, and show more clearly, that only those views of God, of creation, of the world, of man, of sin and grace, that have their roots in the Christological truth, are tenable and victorious; in short, that Christianity embodies all true philosophy as well as all spiritual life."

This much is, at all events, certain, that it is by no means indifferent what conceptions we form of the person of the God-man. It would also be against the fundamental principle of evangelical Protestantism to say that the Church has settled once for all, unalterably and infallibly, the terms concerning the mode of the twofold nature of the God-man, and thus made all further searching of the Scriptures on this mystery useless. When the angels desire to look into this mystery why should not we also desire it, since it concerns us much more than them? Although we can never fathom this mystery, which must forever be an object of faith, it is nevertheless our sacred duty *to learn to understand so much of it as the Scriptures enable us to know, and as we can comprehend without affecting our faith in the fact on which the mystery is based.* We find accordingly that the Church, in the very first centuries of her existence, turned her attention in this direction, and endeavored, in her confessions of faith, logically to define what she believed with the heart. What difficulties she encountered in these her endeavors, and how she labored to meet them, we shall now briefly state, or, in other words, we shall show how manifold attempts have been made to make the mystery of the incarnation intelligible to human reason and to meet the objection raised by philosophy, namely, that the union of the divine and the human in the person of the Redeemer would be something self-contradictory, and therefore impossible. In pursuing these inquiries, we would however entreat the reader to bear in mind that the fact of the incarnation is no less firmly established, even if all efforts that have been made or may be made to define the mystery in terms satisfactory to philosophy shall prove abortive. The failure of all the efforts that have thus far been made to bring the mystery within the reach of human comprehension, either proves that human reason is absolutely unable to form a proper conception of the manner in which God and man are personally united, or that on this point the Scriptures have not yet

been thoroughly understood, and that therefore the proper definitions have not yet been found. The heart has never called the fact itself in question, whenever it received revealed truth at all. A comparison of the different modifications of the dogma on the person of Christ will, moreover, point out the limits within which we must remain if we desire to have the whole Christ, the God-man; and the more clearly we understand the truth, that Jesus Christ is true God and true man, the more precious it will be to our hearts. Luther says significantly: "Whoever firmly believes that Jesus Christ is true God and true man, that died for us and rose again, will find all other articles of faith natural and necessary. I have also seen that all error, heresy, idolatry, offense, abuse, and malice in the Church originally grew out of the neglect of this article of faith concerning the person of Christ." As early as the first centuries of the Christian Church, the endeavors to make the dogma concerning the person of Christ palatable to philosophy led to the denial of the divine or the human nature in Christ. While the Ebionites saw in Jesus a mere man, others saw in him a higher being, that had assumed the human body not in reality but only in appearance. The Gnostics of the second century adopted the views of the second class; while Paul of Samosata, in the third century, espoused those of the Ebionites. The Sabellians also did not recognize a real union of the divine and the human in Christ. The Photinists and Apollinarians taught, that in the person of Jesus the Logos filled the place of the human spirit (*πνεῦμα*,) or of the faculty of discursive thought and will (*νοῦς*.) To the Arians the Logos in Jesus was a creature, however highly exalted, and his divinity only delegated. But after these Arian and Apollinarian errors had been rejected, new difficulties arose as to the personal union of the divine and the human in the Redeemer. Nestorius taught that the divine and the human were but mechanically united in Jesus, like two boards that are fastened together; that the Logos had created for himself in the womb of the virgin the man Jesus, in order to unite himself with him, to live in him as his temple, and to use him as his instrument; while Eutyches, his opponent, taught the other extreme of the same error, namely, that the Logos had made himself of one nature with the son of Mary. The Œcumenical Synod of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, rejected both these errors, and taught that the Redeemer had the two attributes of divinity and humanity perfectly unimpaired, namely, the eternal divine being and true humanity unchanged, unmixed, and inseparable. But the disputes did not end here. The question was asked, how it was about the will in this person consisting of two natures. The sixth Œcumenical Council

of Constantinople, A. D. 680, accordingly decreed, that there were two wills in Christ notwithstanding his personal unity, a divine and a human will, and that the human obeyed the divine (will.) During the middle ages the subject was left alone, but in the times of the Reformation the Lutherans and the Reformed started opposing views with regard to it.

Gess, in his valuable work on the Person of Christ, states and refutes the views of the two parties, as follows: "Since the Redeemer is at the same time God and man in one person, the main object of the Lutheran Church from the beginning was to view the divine and the human life as truly one, and on this was based the doctrine that the divine nature in Christ communicates its attributes to the human nature, and that on the other hand the divine nature had part in Christ's sufferings. By the *communicatio idiomatum* is meant that the omniscient, holy, omnipresent, and omnipotent Logos communicates his omniscience, holiness, omnipotence, and omnipresence to the human assumed nature, and that from the very moment of the conception. But if Jesus was born as an omniscient, holy, omnipresent, and omnipotent child, how is it then with his humanity, with his redemption by means of his active and passive obedience?"

"In order to maintain the really human development of Jesus as man beside the divine nature and works of Christ as the Logos, the Reformed theologians\* said: 'As the Logos, Jesus was on earth omnipotent, absolutely holy, uninterruptedly blessed, the omnipotent, omnipresent Governor and Ruler of the universe; but as a man he passed from ignorance to knowledge, learned obedience after the manner of men, was dependent, circumscribed,' etc. Thus they divide the life of Jesus and all its functions into two parallel lines, that of the divine Logos and that of human development, saying: the two lines must be recognized in their essential, specific peculiarities, but the development of his twofold life was that of the same person, of the same Ego. But how can two so radically different kinds of life proceed from and return to the same Ego? How can the eternal self-consciousness of the Logos be also that of the infant Jesus? How the Ego of the omniscient Logos the Ego of the learning Jesus? How can the Ego of the Logos, that rests in absolute holiness in the will of the Father and in supreme happiness, be the Ego of Jesus agonizing in the garden? If we ascribe to Christ such a twofold life, it is indispensably necessary to vindicate to either kind of life an Ego corresponding to its peculiarities.

\* The Reformed view is for the most part held by the different evangelical denominations of this country.

But in this way we get instead of one Christ two Christs, and instead of the *God-man a God and a man.*"

It can really not be denied, that if the divine and the human nature in Christ, though said to constitute but one person, are so separated, that whatever the one does or suffers does not affect the other; that consequently the human nature suffers, the divine performs miracles, the one is omnipresent, the other circumscribed, and if the interchange of the predicates in the Scriptures, according to which that which belongs to one nature is ascribed to the other, is considered a mere figure of speech, such a view of the person of Christ is hardly distinguishable from Nestorianism. In the place of the real union of the Deity and humanity in one and the same person, we thus get, without being aware of it, a combination, a co-operation of two subsistences or beings, a divine and a human one, between which our view of Christ and his work must continually fluctuate, so as to ascribe the human development, the obedience and the sufferings of the God-man to the human soul or nature of the Redeemer, but the merits of his redemption to his divine nature. The New Testament does not thus set forth Christ, but declares most positively that the Ego of the Jesus on earth was identical with the Ego that was before with the Father in glory.

Since neither the Lutheran or the Reformed definitions concerning the personal union of the Logos and of the human nature in Christ are satisfactory, the attempt has been made to *make it appear as a gradual concrescence of the human and the divine nature in Christ.* According to this view the incarnation of the Logos was not a momentary act, completed in the moment of the conception, but a gradual process, and Jesus at first was nothing else than a mere human being conceived by the Holy Ghost; but by means of the perfect sinlessness and holiness of Jesus it became possible for the Logos not only to infuse into Jesus one measure after another of the fullness of his divine life, but also to become at length the very Ego in Jesus. This view is refuted by *Gess*, as follows: "Let us look at Jesus, who, according to this view, was gradually pervaded by the Logos, but was anterior to his resurrection not yet one person with him! He calls himself *the Son of man*. If the incarnation of the Logos took place in the moment of the conception, if therefore the man Jesus in his gradual self-development was the Logos in the form of human development, we easily understand this self-designation of Jesus; he was the prototype of humanity. But if Jesus was not the incarnate Logos himself, but merely a human being conceived by the Holy Ghost, with whom the Logos became gradually *one being*, he was only a



member, not the representative of humanity. In the next place, how is it about the value of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, if he was at the time of his death, indeed near, but not yet fully in a personal union with the Logos? It can then not be said that he offered himself through the eternal Spirit unto God, and became a priest by virtue of his endless life. (Heb. ix, 14; vii, 16.) The Logos took consequently no part in the sufferings of Christ; but what good can such a Redeemer do unto us? In the last place, if the normal development of Jesus had for its object a gradual concrescence with the Logos, why is it that we do not find the most distant intimation of it in the New Testament? Jesus speaks daily of his relation to the Father, who sent him, to whom he represents himself as being obedient, who was with him, to whom he would return, in whose glory he would come again, while he says not one word of the Logos, who, according to the view under consideration, takes possession of him, with whom he is to become, in the full sense of the term, one Spirit. Emphatically he says: 'The Father is in me and I in the Father,' but of the Logos he says no such word. Nor do the apostles anywhere intimate such a relation of Jesus to the Logos." Gess shows likewise that a gradual indwelling of the Logos in Jesus and the completion of the personal union in the resurrection, would be perfectly at variance with the positive declarations of the Scriptures concerning the Logos, such as: "I have gone forth from the Father, and come into this world." Again: "I leave this world, and go to the Father;" "Glorify me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was;" "If you shall see now the Son of man ascend to where he was before;" "God has sent forth his Son, born of a woman;" "He has emptied himself, assuming the form of a servant, born after the similitude of men." All these declarations of Christ, all these declarations of his apostles, plainly teach that the same personality or Ego, which spoke and tabernacled on earth, had had glory before in heaven, and that the same Ego, that before had glory in heaven, afterward spoke and tabernacled on earth. At first the Logos became flesh and *then* dwelt among us, (John i, 14.) What had been from the beginning, the disciples afterward beheld with their eyes and handled with their hands. (1 John i, 1.)

We see thus what difficulties beset every attempt to solve the mystery of the personal oneness of the God-man. But have not all these difficulties their origin in the supposition *that the Logos in the absolute infinitude of his being united himself with an individual man, created by the Holy Ghost, to constitute with him one personality? and is this supposition really founded on the Scriptures?* Is not rather the solution of this apparently irrecon-

cilable contradiction to be sought in what the Scriptures say of the Logos emptying himself, (Phil. ii, 6, 7;) of his laying aside the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, (John xvii, 5;) of his becoming poor, (2 Cor. viii, 9?) Do not the simple words of the evangelist, "And the Word became flesh," (John i, 14,) contain the key for the proper understanding of the personality of the God-man? Is the plain meaning of these words about this: The Logos united himself in the absolute infinitude of his being with the man Jesus, begotten by the Holy Ghost, to constitute one personality with him? or is it rather: the Logos, without giving up his divine substance—a thing that would be an impossibility—became, by assuming flesh and blood, a human being, living in a truly human form of existence and in human lowliness? In short, does the passage not clearly mean that the Logos, without giving up his divine nature, became to all intents and purposes a man? That he, who is God, from God, and in God from all eternity, entered into the sphere of time and space; that he, by an act of emptying himself, subjected himself to human development, and assumed human existence and life, human will and intuition, feeling and thinking? Does not the oneness of the divine and the human in Christ consist in this: that he, retaining his divine nature, took upon himself as an attribute the human form of existence and human condition, and in consequence thereof had human feeling, human will, and human thinking? Is not the subject of the incarnation, which is described as an act of self-emptying, the Logos himself? Does not the development of the incarnate Logos in time, his acting and suffering, take place, according to the Scriptures, in the perfect identity of this divine human being? Do the Scriptures ever distinguish between the personal-human and the personal-divine principle in Jesus? Do they ever recognize a specifically personal-human principle besides the divine principle of his personality? Do they not, on the contrary, proceed throughout on the assumption that the antemundane Logos is identical with the man Jesus on earth as a divine-human personality? Is the distinction between the human and the divine principle of personality not a mere abstract reflection, perfectly unknown to the Scriptures? Is it not rather the uniform doctrine of the Scriptures, that the two natures in Christ are so united in one person, that the human nature never excludes the divine, nor the divine the human? Is it not exactly this truth which the Church has always been anxious to proclaim and maintain, by ascribing to one person two natures, the divine and the human? And is the explanation of the personal oneness of the God-man, as indicated in those questions, not presupposed and con-

firmed by the common consciousness of the Christian Church, which knows nothing greater and nothing more precious, than that the Father gave his only-begotten Son, (John iii, 16;) that he sent him in the form of sinful flesh, born of a woman, (Rom. viii, 3; Gal. iv, 4;) that the Son of God, out of love to us, came down from heaven, (John vi, 38;) went out from the Father, (John xvi, 28;) became poor for our sake, (2 Cor. viii, 9;) emptied himself and took upon himself the form of a servant? (Phil. ii, 7.)

An affirmative answer to these questions constitutes both the basis and the aim of modern Christology, as held by most of the evangelical divines of Germany. This view is called "Kenotic," after the Greek term (*κένωσις*) used by the apostle Paul, (Phil. ii, 7,) in order to express the act of self-emptying on the part of the Son of God. Other divines, however, have been, and to a great extent still are loth to adopt this plain and natural method, from fear of either impairing the unchangeableness of the divine being, or of raising Christ's true humanity at the expense of his divinity. That great care is here necessary, and that some advocates of the *kenosis* have gone too far in developing their doctrine, will appear from what we have to say hereafter. Without any force, however, are objections like the following: "If the Son of God is viewed as having become to all intents and purposes a man, as existing fully in the human form of existence, his divine nature is thereby denied; or if the Son of God only took upon himself the attributes of human nature, without an individual human soul, he is not like unto us in being; he was only a God in a human body." This objection takes for granted what must be proved first, and is in reality aimed at the mystery itself as taught by the Scriptures. It cannot be denied that the New Testament ascribes to one and the same person true humanity and true divinity, without anywhere teaching us to ascribe the one to the *Logos* and the other to the man Jesus; while it is plain, on the other hand, that Jesus, as *the* Son of man, never places himself on an equal footing with other men. He was a real man, but on a different basis from that of other men.

Equally unfounded is the objection: "To assume any self-limitation on the part of God is inconsistent with the unchangeableness of the divine being!" God's immutability is that perfection of his, by virtue of which *God's will and God's nature remain in constant harmony*. Every change must, as a matter of course, be rejected that would bring God's will or nature in conflict with himself. But any act on the part of God affecting his life internally or externally, that is, in harmony with the divine will and being, is consistent with the divine immutability. To deny such acts on the

part of God is to deny the *living God himself*. A God without a motion internally or externally would be, according to the Scriptures, a nullity, a dead god, an idol. "The very idea," says Ebrard, "of God as the living one implies the possibility of a self-limitation or change of self; of course of such a change by which God continues as God, and in which he has at all times the power of asserting his infinitude. In the divine being this is possible through the Trinity. As the Triune God distinguishes himself from himself, there rests, consequently, in his being the possibility for him to distinguish himself from himself also in time; that is, to receive within himself the difference between existence within time and out of time."

That the Son of God can become a man without thereby destroying his true divinity, even the fathers of the Church taught. Tertullian says: "God can change himself into everything, and yet remain (in substance) what he is." Hilary says: "The form of God and the form of a servant can indeed not unqualifiedly become a unity, but exclude themselves rather, such as they are. But how does their union become a possibility? Answer: Only by giving up the one, the other can be assumed. But he that has emptied himself and taken upon himself the form of a servant, is therefore not a different person. *To give up a form does not imply the destruction of its substance.* Exactly in order to prevent this destruction, the act of self-emptying goes only far enough to constitute the form of a servant."

Ebrard makes the fitting comparison: "If a crown prince, in order to set others free, should go for the time being into voluntary servitude, he would be to all intents and purposes a servant; and as he has not forfeited his claims to the crown, also a prince, so that he could with propriety be called both servant and a prince: in the same manner Jesus was the true and eternal God, and at the same time a true and real man, and it can be said with propriety of him, the Son of God is man and the man Jesus Christ is God." To this is added by the author of "*Die Biblische Glaubenslehre*," published by the "Calwer Verein": "The same is the case with man, who, notwithstanding the various changes of his circumstances here, and the great changes which he shall undergo in the resurrection, is still the same person. We meet even in God with a change of conditions. He rested before and after he had created the world; does this not imply a self-limitation on the part of God? Again, the personality of God, what else is it than a self-comprehension of the infinite? Yet in all these self-limitations God remains God. Should then the Son not be able to remain in substance what he is, if out of compassion for fallen humanity he becomes a man, and in order to become a man lays aside his divine glory?"

This leads us then to the main question: *What have we to understand by the divine glory which the Son laid aside during his sojourn on earth?* To this question the Christologians, who adopt the kenosis, return different answers. We are met here again by the old difficulty to unite the divine and the human in one self-consciousness. The question is this: whether the self-consciousness of the God-man is mainly the divine self-consciousness of the eternal Son, or the self-consciousness of the assumed human nature. Gess takes the latter view, and says, that in order to do justice to the true humanity of Jesus Christ it is necessary to consistently carry out the self-emptying act of the Logos, so that the Son of God, in the act of the incarnation, laid aside the divine attributes of omnipotence and omniscience and his divine self-consciousness, and regained the latter gradually in the way of a really human development, in such a manner as not to affect the true and real divinity of Christ. Whether a temporary laying aside of the divine self-consciousness is consistent with the immutability of the divine being, we need not discuss here. The argumentation of Gess is very acute, and may appear to the metaphysician as the most consistent and satisfactory analysis of the personal union of the divine and the human in the person of Christ; but exegetically it seems to us as untenable as it is unfit for the practical edification of the Christian people, and a theology that cannot be preached intelligibly from the pulpit is justly to be suspected.

As it may however be of some interest to the reader to know in what manner Gess, who teaches so decidedly and uniformly the divinity proper of the Saviour, endeavors to make the suspension of the divine self-consciousness by the Logos consistent with his real divinity, we shall give his argumentation in a condensed form. He discourses as follows:

"The Logos by taking upon himself flesh and blood became a human being, that is, a being that exists in a really human form and lowliness; or in other words, the human flesh and blood, which he took upon himself, became, through this assumption, a determining power for the Logos, in the same manner as the bodily organization—apart from sin—is by the Creator's will the controlling power for the soul. The development of the soul's life is by God's appointment so conditioned by the development of the life of the body, that a certain growth of the body is required before the soul can awake into a life of consciousness and will, and as a personal soul make the bodily organization subject to the appointed laws of God. Christians profess, according to 1 John iv, 2, Jesus to be the incarnate Son of God. The Logos, who was from the beginning, has come in the flesh; that is, by assuming flesh and blood he became flesh, a truly human soul, clothed with flesh and blood.

"No human being is omniscient, omnipotent, omnipresent; therefore Jesus was so neither. This antemundane glory he laid aside in his incarnation. Man is in the first phase of his life not even conscious of himself; he has no

self-consciousness neither in his mother's womb, nor for some time after his birth, and attains but by degrees to feeling, and then to self-consciousness. It is true, the Scriptures do not expressly declare that the Logos laid aside his self-consciousness in his incarnation; but it is the consistent development of the Scriptural doctrine concerning the self-emptying of the Son, and the only key that unlocks the proper understanding of the real humanity of the Son, if we say that in his incarnation he laid aside also his antemundane self-consciousness in order to regain it in the ordinary way of the development of a human soul. And when he regained it in this way he had it before his resurrection only in the form of a human self-consciousness, subject to the changes which proceed from the bodily organization. In the eternal perfection of his self-consciousness in his antemundane state the Logos beheld the depths of the Deity and the life of the universe, that is, he was omniscient; in the same manner the Logos merged in eternal perfection his own being and his own will in that of his Father, that is, he was absolutely holy; but after he had determined himself to possess his self-consciousness no longer as an eternal one, but as one that is developing in the course of time, he had in consequence thereof also his knowledge of God and of the universe, as well as the merging of his being and will in that of God, in a state of development, that is, he entered into a state in which he had to *acquire* knowledge and to *learn* obedience. Besides his omniscience, he had also parted with his sovereign government of the world, or his omnipotence and his omnipresence. This must not be understood as if these attributes had been absolutely lost; by no means, since the substance of the Logos on earth was the same that it had been before, and we might say that these powers had, as it were, entered a state of rest, to which their moving cause, the self-consciousness of the Logos, had reduced them. The self-determination of the Logos, to suspend his eternal self-consciousness, and to possess it for the time of his sojourn on earth not as an eternally perfect one, but as one in a state of development, is indeed something which, from the nature of the case, must be without any analogy in the sphere of our knowledge. But is it for this reason irreconcilable with the Godhead? By no means. The mystery that the Logos determined himself to suspend his eternal self-consciousness, and thereby lay aside his omniscience, his omnipresence, and his omnipotence, finds its solution in the fact that he was no creature, but the God—Logos. A man's dependence consists not only in this, that he cannot reach a height of power which God has not given him, but also in this, that he cannot bring his life to a close and dip it in unconsciousness as long as God sees fit to grant him life and self-consciousness. How readily would the damned choose the state of unconsciousness or even of non-existence—but they cannot! Whoever does not produce his life cannot stop it himself. But the Logos is God; he has life in himself like the Father; the Father's life flowing over into him, which he receives by his own free act, is the basis of his life; his self-consciousness is his own deed. Therefore he can suspend his self-consciousness. The Logos would not be omnipotent if he had no power over himself. The omnipotence of God must indeed not be viewed as unqualifiedly illimited; his liberty is not arbitrariness. The limit of God's power is his holiness. He cannot do what is not holy, consequently not necessary and rational, for he cannot *will* it. But his holiness is the only limit of his power. If now God's holiness wills it that we be saved, and if the only method to effect this is the incarnation of the Logos, and if the incarnation of the Logos involves his self-determination, to have his eternal self-consciousness for the time of his sojourn upon earth no longer as an eternal one, but as one that is in a state of development, then this transition of his eternal self-consciousness into a human one that develops itself must be possible. Or should his power be less than his holy love? But it is the deed of love to become poor in order to make others rich. In this



way it wins its eternal price. In order to prove from the idea of God that this self-emptying act of the Logos is inconceivable and repugnant to the idea of God, one has to prove that this deed is not a deed of holy love. But such a proof is utterly impossible. It is true, if the Logos in becoming poor became so forever, so as to be unable hereafter to make any one rich, then this act of his to empty himself could not be a deed of holy love.

"But he regains his riches, his antemundane glory; the exalted Jesus is glorified with the same glory which the antemundane Son had. And he indeed regains it after he has revealed the name of God unto men, has stood atoning for them before God and has made himself the author of spiritual life for them, and by virtue of this communicates to them his life of glory. No one can therefore say that this miracle of the incarnation, the self-determination of the Logos to become a helpless unconscious child in Mary's womb, involves an impossibility; the nature of God, his omnipotent love, makes it possible. Nor does the transition of the Eternal One into the form of existence in time, and of the Omnipresent One entering into space, involve a contradiction. The Eternal entering the sphere of time is nothing else than the ideas of the Eternal God realizing themselves in the development of time. And as regards the transition of the Omnipresent One into space, it may be well to bear in mind that God, although he is limited by no space, could not be omnipresent if he could not be in all parts of space, and from this follows his ability, to exist in space if he sees fit to be so. Let it likewise be borne in mind that the human soul, though the breath of God and therefore above space, is notwithstanding this indissolubly united with the body as its organization, and thus far subject to the laws of space."

The Christology of Gess may be summed up in the following three theses:

"1. The Father gives unto the Son to have life in himself, as the Father has life in himself; for this reason the Son is God, and the source of life for the world. On the same foundation rest his omniscience, his omnipotent government of the world, his omnipresence. The Son, on his part, receives into himself the fullness of life. He is willing to receive it only from the Father, and to have it for the Father, and merges it in the Father; this constitutes his eternal holiness.

"2. But the Logos became flesh. He determines to suspend his eternal self-consciousness and his eternal will in order to resume it in the proper time, and in proportion to the development and strength of the bodily organism, with which he unites himself in the form of human development. From this it follows that the flowing over of the Father's fullness into the Son ceases for the time of his sojourn upon earth. Where there is no receiving there is no giving; the Son, existing in a state of unconsciousness and then in the narrow limits of self-consciousness and human will, does not receive into himself the infinite stream of the Father's life. During this period the Son lives by the Father, as the disciple of the exalted Saviour lives through the Saviour. The Father is in the Son on earth too, but the Son receives the Father's fullness into himself only wave by wave, just as the disciples can drink only by drops the life-stream of the exalted Saviour.

"3. But although the Logos has after his incarnation no longer his eternal self-consciousness nor will, yet the substance of the Logos is still the same after his having become man. The substance of our human soul, that now lives within so narrow limits, and that will hereafter live in the liberty of eternal life, is in a similar manner the same. It is this identity of the Son's substance before and after the incarnation which constitutes Christ's superiority to men and angels while he was on earth. On the other hand, the change of the divine form of self-consciousness and will into the human form of self-conscious-

ness and will, and the ceasing of the overflow of the Father's fullness into the Son, as conditioned thereby, constitutes the basis on which Christ's equality with other men rests. A proper attention to these two points makes the development of the life of the incarnate Son intelligible."

The objection that the spirit being no substance at all, no distinction can be made between its substance and its activity in feeling and knowing itself, in willing, in knowing what is beyond itself and in acting thereon, is met by Gess as follows:

"Our own experience sufficiently proves that the soul of man *exists* before it feels and knows itself, before it acts, and it is equally well known that the body is subject to diseases in which the soul suspends its activity; but as soon as the health of the body returns, the soul is again as it was before the disease. It has perhaps no remembrance whatever of the time of the disease, which proves that it was unconscious, but now its life breaks forth again. All thorough psychological study teaches likewise that the soul embodies a good deal more, both good and bad, than it is conscious of in every moment. To know and to will without a substance that knows and wills, is indeed an absurdity. For this reason there can be no worse advocate of the doctrine concerning the spirit against materialism than this idealism; for denying, as it does, the independent substance of the spirit, there is nothing left from which the spirit can be derived, as its source, except the life of the body."

But how can such a laying aside of the divine self-consciousness, as Gess assumes, be reconciled with the many declarations of Christ concerning himself as the Son of God, the consciousness of which fact he was not gradually gaining, but had in perfection, as the only begotten of the Father, from whom he went forth as such and came into the world, without the least intimation of an interruption or laying aside of this his dignity? If he had regained his divine self-consciousness, by means of a gradual development, in a purely human manner, how could he have spoken so positively of his antemundane glory, of his eternal divinity? how could he have said, "Before Abraham was, I am? No one ascends up to heaven except he that has come down from heaven, the Son of man, who is in heaven. Who sees me, sees the Father. As the Father has life in himself, so he has given to the Son, to have life in himself. I am the bread that came down from heaven and that giveth life unto the world."

If he had possessed the consciousness of his eternal equality with the Father only in a human form, and regained it as the result of his divine-human development, how could he have claimed equal honor with the Father? how could he have forgiven sins? Again, if he had unqualifiedly laid aside his omnipotence, those of his miracles could indeed be accounted for which he himself ascribed to the Father, but not those which he performed in his own name. How could the transfiguration of his body upon the holy mountain, which Peter calls the power and appearance of divine glory, be derived from a merely human development of his divine nature?

We conclude from all this, with *Liebner* and other Christologians, that by the glory which the Son of God laid aside during his sojourn on earth we must not understand his divine self-consciousness, not the fullness of the Deity, as far as it can manifest itself in a human manner. On the contrary it is said of this very glory: "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. . . . And of his fullness have all we received grace for grace." This divine fullness the Son did not give up at his incarnation, but it followed him as his peculiar property from heaven, from out of the Father's bosom, to legitimate him as the Logos, as the only begotten of the Father, yet so that he turned it into a divine-human glory, acquired in a human manner. Only the form of God, the divine form of existence, consequently the transcendent divine majesty and sovereign power over all things united with uninterrupted glory, he had exchanged at his incarnation, and during the time of his sojourn on earth, for his human form of existence, for the form of the servant. Into this his antemundane glory however he re-entered (John xvii, 5) on his going home to his Father, (John vi, 62,) also in the capacity of the exalted Son of man, (Phil. ii, 9.) But on every stage of his divine-human development the Son's oneness of being and of will with the Father remained; and by this very fact he was in his human teaching and conduct the express image of the invisible God, the personal revealer of him who had sent him, the Son of God, in the form of human existence. According to this view the immanent relation of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost did not suffer any change by the laying aside of the divine form of existence on the part of the Son, nor during the time of his existence in human form. And only according to this view have the words of the incarnate Son of God their full force: "Believe me, that I am in the Father and the Father in me; if not, believe me for the very works' sake. The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works." John xiv, 10, 11.

If it is objected that the really human development of Jesus is inconsistent with or excluded by the uninterrupted continuance of the eternal self-consciousness of the Logos in the incarnation, we answer that this inference does not necessarily follow. There is nothing self-contradictory in the assumption that the incarnate Logos had in his one Ego the consciousness of his twofold nature. Even if we cannot explain how the Logos was conscious of himself, as the eternal Son of God, and yet had this self-consciousness only in a human form, yet the consciousness of his twofold nature was necessary for the mediatorial office of the incarnate Logos; he was

to know himself according to his absolute divinity and his human development; and if we suppose that only so much of his divine self-consciousness *as was necessary for his mediatorial office*, passed over into his human self-consciousness, this twofold self-consciousness is in perfect agreement with his purely human life and with his mediatorial office. As to the divine attributes or powers that are connected with the divine self-consciousness, there is nothing self-contradictory in the supposition that the divine Ego of the Logos acted with the powers of human nature, with human self-consciousness and human will, if we *adopt the above mentioned relative self-limitation of the divine knowledge and will as necessary for the mediatorial office*. But even if by this view of the personal oneness of the divine and the human in Christ the metaphysical difficulty should not be fully removed, we would prefer confessing the unfathomable depth of this mystery to any philosophical solution of the problem which we could not fully reconcile with the plain teachings of the word of God.

---

#### ART. VIII.—THE AMERICAN PULPIT.

*Annals of the American Pulpit*; or, Commemorative Notices of Distinguished American Clergymen of various Denominations, from the Early Settlement of the Country to the close of the Year eighteen hundred and fifty-five. With Historical Introductions. By WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE, D. D. Six volumes, 8vo. Volumes I and II, Trinitarian Congregational; III and IV, Presbyterian; V, Episcopalian; VI, Baptist. New-York: Carter & Brothers. 1857-60.

THE most important result of the discovery of America was the opening of a new continent to Christianity. Worldly men interested in that discovery, whether navigators or monarchs, thought only of new fields of commerce and dominion. The Church of that period had just vitality enough to be eager for such enlargements of its territory and its revenues as might be won by the easy process of ceremonial occupation. Ambition and avarice worked freely together in the conquest of the New World, and both won blood-stained trophies of triumph in the fair lands upon which they precipitated their hordes of adventurers. Judging from the results of the Christianization which papal countries introduced into Mexico and Central and South America, it is questionable whether, in a religious point of view, those parts of the New World might not as well have been left to their original heathenism. We would not under-

rate the good which Romanism has done in abolishing human sacrifices and semi-civilizing sundry tribes of savages; but we must be allowed to deprecate in the severest terms its parody of true Christianity, its compromises with paganism, and its interdict of God's word from the regions over which it has obtained sway in America and elsewhere. Not for such results only was the New World thrown open to the Christian Church. God, in his providence, was beginning to disturb the slumbers of the dark ages. The Bible was about to be exhumed from its conventual grave, and men were about to be raised up who, by their earnest religious life, and their faithful proclamation of divine truth, were to shake the papal throne to its foundation. Room was wanted for the glorious movement—room not preoccupied by decaying nationalities, and the stumbling-blocks of semi-pagan ceremonies and debasing superstitions. At the right time such room was provided, and as years advanced it was occupied, too, in such a manner as to bring the results of a ceremonial Christianity into direct contrast with the earnest spirit and practical zeal of a preached Gospel.

In Spanish and Portuguese America there can scarcely be said to be a pulpit. Preaching desks there are in the larger churches and cathedrals, but they are only occasionally used; rarely, indeed, save on festival occasions, when they are employed more usually for eulogizing the saints than for preaching Christ. Not so in the America of the pilgrims and their descendants. Here, from the first, the pulpit has been an institution of the land and an essentiality of the Church. Ceremonies have been ignored, but the Gospel has been preached. The camp of the emigrant, the cabin of the settler, the log school-house and meeting-house, the chapel and the church, have successively been made to resound with the word of life. By the pulpit the masses of the people have been instructed, and the fruits of righteousness have appeared.

Thus, in two hundred years, has sprung up one of the fairest and most promising branches of the Christian Church. Around her altars has the gathering of the nations been. But not content with instructing the strangers that have come within her gates, the American Church has sent forth her messengers into all the world to preach the Gospel. While many of the more ancient Churches are still slumbering at their ease, and known chiefly in the history of the past, the Church of America is already making her influence powerfully felt in Europe, Asia, Africa, and the islands of the most distant oceans. This, too, is the Church of North America, while that of South America requires itself to be evangelized.

The pulpit, as the living exponent of God's word, is the grand

characteristic of American Christianity; and while it has been doing so much for our land and for the nations of the earth, numerous have become the preachers. "The Lord gave the word: great was the company of those that published it." The clergy of America have never aspired to hierarchal honors; they have never been salaried by a national treasury. They have never been the stipendiaries of ancient foundations, but, trusting to the voluntary support of an intelligent people, they have gone to their work like men of God, and he has graciously sustained them in it. The world has never known a class of men of higher intellectuality, of more generous culture, of larger benevolence, of more consistent piety, or of a more positive personal influence. Living, they make their mark upon every feature of their age; and dead, they yet speak, their works following them.

Such men are the makers of history; and though they do not figure in scenes of strife, and oftentimes their noblest deeds never challenge the public gaze, yet they live for glorious purposes, and they receive "the honor which cometh down from God." It is fitting, too, that men should honor them, and that the pulpit should have its published annals.

Jerome, in the fourth century, saw this, and wrote his celebrated work, "*De Illustribus Viris*," a book from which we have the best notices of the Christian preachers who succeeded the apostles down to the author's day. The true history of the Church must ever be largely composed of the lives and actions of Christian ministers; and treatises upon ecclesiastical history, whether ancient or modern, are usually interesting in proportion to the power and skill of their authors in displaying the characters who have moulded and influenced successive ages, together with the bearings of their individual and collective action. History, whether sacred or secular, if written without lively portraiture of character, is stiff and stately, like dull frescoes on solid walls. That which throws humanity into the foreground, and gives it life and motion, charms us like a moving panorama.

But even though we see characters moving and acting upon the historic page, it is pleasant and instructive oftentimes to contemplate them in their individual relations. Hence from the best written Grecian and Roman histories we delight to turn to the pages of Plutarch, to gaze as in a gallery upon the well-drawn portraiture of individuals; to see Cicero and Demosthenes, Pericles and Fabius, Cesar and Alexander side by side.

Biography, in whatever form it is written, must ever be the soul of history. Hence the work of Dr. Sprague, to which our attention is now directed, although primarily contemplating another design, is



one of the most generous contributions to American Church history yet made. We prefer, however, to regard its chief merit in accordance with its primary object. It was due to the memory of the fathers of the American Church that their names should be rescued from the obscurity of the past, and presented for edification and instruction to the present and future. Not less fitting was it that worthy names of the present day should be embalmed in cotemporary records, and handed down to rising generations. The inspiration of so noble an undertaking came upon the right man at the right time.

The middle of our century is a fitting *terminus adquem* for such a work. Closing at a much earlier period, it would have lacked a certain completeness which the annals have. Deferred later it would have been difficult if not impossible to secure much of the data without which no future work of the kind can ever be complete.

Dr. Sprague has now been more than forty years in active ministerial life, in circumstances which have brought him into most favorable and extensive personal acquaintance with the clergy of various denominations. From early life he has cherished a peculiar interest and manifested extraordinary diligence in the collection of autographs. This taste of itself naturally brought him into correspondence with a vast number of clerical celebrities, while his careful habits of observation and his fondness for the illustration of character have for a series of years been co-operating to accumulate a mass of data under his hand which Providence was evidently designing for some worthy end.

About fourteen years since the idea occurred to him of a work like the present. With characteristic energy, and a skill which nothing but previous and extensive practice in authorship could have qualified him to exercise, he at once set about the accomplishment of a task of the magnitude of which at that time even he himself had but a limited conception. Not content to avail himself merely of published sources of information, and wielding the pen of a "ready writer," Dr. Sprague at that time commenced a series of personal correspondence which, though far from finished, yet has probably never had its equal in the history of letters.

The plan of the "Annals of the American Pulpit" became gradually developed, and though not free from various difficulties, has been matured with large discretion. The first temptation of an author contemplating "commemorative notices of distinguished clergymen" would doubtless have been prolixity, especially in cases where abundant materials were accessible. Yet to have indulged in extended memoirs, even of extraordinary characters, would necessa-

rily either have excluded many worthy names or have rendered the work interminable. The author in this respect has hit upon a golden mean well adapted to his purpose. The Annals are indeed voluminous, but this is a necessity growing out of the great number of subjects, among whom his pages are divided with a very just equation of space. Not unfrequently the reader becomes interested to read more about a given person than the Annals contain, and at such a moment to complain of them as meager in detail. A little reflection will show that such complaint would be unreasonable, for had a volume been devoted to each character, few libraries could have aspired to embrace the entire series. The most however, that can be desired in any special case is indicated by the notes and marginal references, which specify with great care all the sources of information extant with reference to individual subjects.

The author's general plan has been to prepare from the best sources, and usually in his own language, a brief memoir of each subject, to be followed by one or more letters of personal recollection from individuals who actually knew the deceased while living. For the sake of securing this *original* testimony on the important point of character, Dr. Sprague has been willing to sacrifice some literary attractions, but he has gained greatly in positiveness and fidelity of description. He says, in his general preface:

"The rule, in every case practicable, has been to procure from some well-known person or persons a letter or letters containing their recollections and impressions illustrative of the character; but where there has been no one living to testify, as was uniformly the case with all who died before 1770, I have availed myself of the best testimony of their cotemporaries, from funeral sermons, obituary notices, etc., that I could obtain. And where, as in a few instances, I have not been able even to do this, I have endeavored to substitute that which seemed to me to come *nearest* to original testimony, that is, the opinion of those who, without having known the individuals, were best qualified, from peculiar circumstances, to form a correct judgment concerning them."

"The other characteristic feature of the work is, that it at least *claims* an exemption from denominational partiality. Though I have of course my own theological views and ecclesiastical relations, which I sacredly and gratefully cherish, I have not attempted in this work to defend them even by implication. My only aim has been to present what I supposed to be a faithful outline of the life and character of each individual without justifying or condemning the opinions they have respectively held."

In respect to the claim of impartiality, now that six volumes are before the public, it is but just, while it is faint praise, to say that the author *has succeeded*. In the language of a prominent weekly journal, "Thus far he has not only satisfied but delighted his various denominational readers." The catholicity of the Annals is admirably illustrated in the beautiful commingling of original letters

which the successive volumes contain. In those before us we find Methodists attesting excellence of character in Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Baptists; Presbyterians in Episcopalians, and Baptists in Episcopalians and Presbyterians; while we have reason to know that in the forthcoming volume, to be devoted to Methodist biography, there will be found equally catholic epistles from brethren of other denominations. Not only clergymen but distinguished civilians and statesmen, including at least three ex-presidents of the United States, have joined in the grateful task of commemorating the virtues of deceased ministers of the Gospel.

One very remarkable characteristic of this work consists in its being composed so largely of the contributions of notable persons who have themselves died since recording their recollections of others, to aid in its completion. In 1856 the author wrote as follows:

"Of about five hundred and forty individuals who have contributed to this work, seventy-nine are known to have deceased, and fifty-two have place in it as both contributors and subjects. Quite a number of the contributors have been between eighty and ninety years of age, six between ninety and a hundred, and one has actually completed his century. Of those who have passed ninety, four still survive, retaining almost the intellectual vigor of middle age. This host of veterans, so many of whom have gone to mingle in other scenes, have freely imparted to me their recollections of their early cotemporaries and associates, which must otherwise soon have perished, but which may now be preserved for the benefit of posterity."

Since that date the swelling flood of mortality has carried away an additional host of contributors; and should the venerable author live to complete his task, which is devoutly to be hoped, he will be able to add at its conclusion statements still more affecting.

It has been a matter of some question with us, whether to bring the work of Dr. Sprague fully to the attention of our readers at this stage, or to await the issue of the seventh volume, which will be devoted to Methodist biography. We understand that may be expected by the public near the close of the present year, and that it promises to equal in size any of its predecessors. Having some knowledge of the pains which the author is taking to do full justice to the subject, we trust that it will equal in interest any volume of the series, and that when issued it will be the more highly appreciated from a previous presentation of the connections in which it will appear.

The Annals throughout have a chronological arrangement, which, together with the historical introductions to the biographies of each denomination, secures for them many of the advantages of a consecutive history, without departing from the author's primary design.

We may here incidentally remark that the comparative age of the Churches represented in the first six volumes is indicated by the fact, that of the divines who commenced their ministry anterior to 1700, Dr. S. has commemorated five Episcopalians, three Presbyterians, three Baptists, and eighty-six Congregationalists. Sixty years, with two generations of men, had still to pass away before his first subject among the Methodists arose. Out of many hundreds of individuals commemorated in the volumes now issued, it is curious to observe how very few originated in the same place, or lived, labored, or died under the same or closely similar circumstances. While as to scenes of life and phases of character there is in the annals a never-failing variety, yet in point of religious interest there is a similarity which demonstrates a fact of unspeakable importance to any Christian heart. It is that true religion is the same wherever found, and at whatever period.

As it is our hope to render the present paper useful to the reader, we proceed to make sundry references to Dr. Sprague's volumes, together with such extracts as our space will permit, under a classification not allowed by the author's plan, but which will be found to possess some advantages of its own. Our plan will enable us to group together several classes of characters which we find included among the clergy of America. We will begin with

#### MISSIONARIES.

One of the finest missionary examples on record is that of good JOHN ELIOT, which, standing as it does at the very beginning of Christian efforts in America, will not soon cease to exert its happy influence upon succeeding generations, although there is a tendency of late to allow it to be thrown in the shade by the splendor of foreign missionary enterprise.

Next to Eliot in the work of evangelizing the American Indians were the missionary Mayhews, whose labors, running through three generations, extended from 1646 to 1758. Their connected history is very interesting.

Most of the New England ministers who labored in behalf of the Indians at an early day were also pastors, and preached more or less regularly to English congregations.

The next missionary character of decided interest appeared about the middle of the eighteenth century. It was DAVID BRAINERD.

It was not till the early part of the nineteenth century that the era of modern missions dawned upon the American Church. The circumstances are stated in the notice of Adoniram Judson :

"The result of a conference respecting foreign missions, which then took place between Messrs. Judson, Nott, Newell, Hall, Richards, and Rice, all of them theological students at the time, was, that they resolved to make known their wishes to the General Association of Massachusetts, at its next meeting in June, 1810. Judson drew up a paper setting forth their wishes, and requesting advice as to the propriety of cherishing them, and the proper means of carrying them into effect. This was the incipient step toward the formation of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions."

Mr. Judson's adhesion to the Baptist Church, announced immediately after his arrival in India, was the occasion of the formation of a convention of the Baptist Churches of the United States for the support of missions.

From these, and other missionary societies formed soon after, a glorious company of self-denying and apostolic men and women have been sent forth to evangelize the nations.

Not the least instructive and interesting portions of Dr. Sprague's volumes are the memoirs of distinguished and faithful missionaries. We would call special attention to those of Gordon Hall, Samuel Newell, Samuel J. Mills, Jr., James Richards, Daniel Poor, Pliny Fisk, Levi Parsons, Daniel Temple, William Richards, Samuel Munson, Henry Lyman, George Dana Boardman, John Taylor Jones, Josiah Goddard, and Walter Macon Lowrie. In this honored list Congregationalists outnumber all the other denominations. Including Judson, the Baptists count four; while Presbyterians have one, and Episcopalians none.

But in reading missionary memoirs, especially, we delight to forget denominational distinctions, and feel that the devoted men who have planted the banner of the cross on the shores of India, Burmah, China, Africa, Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor, Borneo, and the Sandwich Islands, are our own beloved brethren in Christ Jesus. If the Churches were as thoroughly imbued with missionary feeling as they ought to be, denominational prejudices would vanish. It is pleasant to hope that such happy results are rapidly approaching, and to believe that whoever may write the annals of the American pulpit for the centuries following the close of Dr. Sprague's book, will have occasion to illuminate his record with a much greater proportion of missionary narratives as well as of missionary triumphs.

#### CLERGYMEN OF THE OLDEN TYPE.

Here, again, the Congregationalists, as the "standing order" of New England, have a marked pre-eminence. For a time they enjoyed the prestige of an Established Church, and, Puritans though they were, right royally did they bear their prerogatives. All

the pretensions of High-Churchmen in this republican nation compare with such realities as shadow does with substance.

Among the worthies of this class deserving special note are Hancock of Massachusetts, Eaton of Maine, and the early clergy of Andover, whose stately habits are thus described by the Hon. Josiah Quincy:

"The period was between 1760 and the Revolution, before the scepter of worldly power, which the first settlers of the colony had placed in the hands of the clergy, had been broken. The parsonage at Andover was situated about two or three hundred rods from the meeting-house, which was three stories high, of immense dimensions, far greater, I should think, than those of any meeting-houses in these anti-church-going degenerate times. It was on a hill, slightly elevated above the parsonage, so that all the flock could see the pastor as he issued from it. Before the time of service the congregation gradually assembled in early season, coming on foot or on horseback, the ladies behind their lords, or their brothers, or one another, on pillions, so that before the time of service the whole space before the meeting-house was filled with a waiting, respectful, and expecting multitude.

"At the moment of service the pastor issued from his mansion with the Bible and manuscript sermon under his arm, with his wife leaning on one arm, flanked by his negro man on his side, as his wife was by her negro woman, the little negroes being distributed, according to their sex, by the side of their respective parents. Then followed every other member of the family according to age and rank, making often with the family visitants somewhat of a formidable procession. As soon as it appeared, the congregation, as if moved by one spirit, began to move toward the door of the church, and before the procession reached it all were in their places. As soon as the pastor entered the Church the whole congregation rose and stood until the pastor was in the pulpit, and his family were seated, until which was done the whole assembly continued standing. At the close of the service the congregation stood until he and his family had left the church before any one moved toward the door. Forenoon and afternoon the same course of proceeding was had, expressive of the reverential relation in which the people acknowledged that they stood toward their clergyman."

Not with the intent of obscuring the glory of the olden time, but rather for the purpose of showing things as they were in another point of view, we might refer to a most painful example of a godly minister being sacrificed as a victim of the witchcraft delusion. Cotton Mather himself was present at the execution, riding round in the crowd, harranguing the people, not against, but in favor of the bloody deed! (See Vol. i, p. 87.)

Not a few of the American clergy of the appropriate period deserve the title of

#### REVOLUTIONARY HEROES.

Prominent among them was NAPHTALI DAGGETT, D. D., who was for twenty years Professor of Divinity at New Haven, and eleven years President of Yale College. Hon. Elizur Goodrich writes at once a thrilling and an amusing narrative of his attacking a detach-



ment of two thousand five hundred British troops alone, and with only his fowling-piece for a weapon !

Similar narratives of bravery, coupled with greater discretion, are given of BENJAMIN TRUMBULL, D. D., of North Haven, Connecticut; THOMAS ALLEN, the first minister of Pittsfield, Massachusetts; GEORGE DUFFIELD, of Philadelphia; JAMES CALDWELL, of Elizabeth, New Jersey, and several others. The number of chaplains of the army of the Revolution who are commemorated in these volumes is very considerable, but many ministers of influence were in positions to render greater service to the patriotic cause than those who actually joined the ranks.

#### DISTINGUISHED EDUCATORS AND SCHOLARS.

A most interesting chapter might be compiled from the *Pulpit Annals*, illustrating the history and character of those American clergymen who usually, in addition to constant labor as preachers, have served as presidents of colleges and professors in collegiate or theological institutions.

It should begin with Henry Dunster, who was made the first president of Harvard in 1640, and come down to the present day. It would be found to embrace the most interesting facts in the history of nearly all the prominent institutions of learning which have sprung up in our country in connection with some of the brightest lights of the several religious denominations.

In the first class we should see, side by side, such men as Increase Mather, Witherspoon, Edwards, Whitlock, Manning, Macey, Dwight, Appleton, Bishop Chase, Fisk, Olin, and many others worthy of the honorable association.

In the field of general and special scholarship we should find another class of men represented by such names as Moses Stuart, Archibald Alexander, Reuel Keith, N. W. Fiske, and others. We cannot forbear to copy the following paragraphs respecting the scholastic habits of Professor Moses Stuart :

"He was systematically and intensely laborious. No man ever practiced a more rigid economy in regard to time, and no man ever schooled himself to a more diligent and conscientious application to hard downright study. The intensity of his application was such that the physical powers could not sustain it more than four hours in the twenty-four; but these four hours came every day, and his power of accomplishment was amazing. He would write pages while a more formal man would be adjusting his spectacles and nibbing his pen. Of his daily study, not a moment of the four hours was lost in trifling, not a moment was exempt from real hard productive labor; the least possible amount of time was consumed in revising or correcting; and though he often wrote and rewrote, and wrote again, on some topics, at different periods, with seven or eight repetitions, yet it was never deliberately or easily, but always in the same impulsive, energetic, hard-working, steam-engine sort of way.

Hence the amount that he accomplished was enormous, and hence, too, all his works were better fitted for the oral instructions of the lecture-room than for the printed page pondered in the closet. His readers can never feel the kindling enthusiasm that was never wanting among his hearers.

"He was as earnest to communicate as he was to acquire. The pleasure of attaining was no greater than the pleasure of imparting; nay, he found it even 'more blessed to give than to receive.' The lecture-room was his paradise, and the circle of admiring pupils his good angels. The delight was mutual. It was thus that he inspired the same enthusiasm that he felt himself. It was wonderfully contagious."

Of scholarship in the direct work of the ministry, the *Annals* furnish numerous creditable examples. That of Dr. JAMES PATRIOT WILSON, of Philadelphia, is conspicuous. Of him it is said:

"Perhaps he was the only clergyman in the United States who had not only read all the Greek and Latin fathers, but who almost literally lived among them. He was perfectly familiar with them all, and knew the peculiar views of each. His fondness for this department of study had grown almost into a passion, and he was desirous that his people should reap the advantage from this kind of intercourse with the men of other ages which he thought he had received himself."

#### AUTHORS.

Probably no class even of literary men furnishes so large a proportion of authors as does that of the clergy. We cannot, of course, enter into even the most summary presentation of the authorship represented in the work before us. We wish to remark, however, the scrupulous care with which Dr. Sprague has given, in connection with each minister's biography, a statement of his several publications, even down to pamphlets and single sermons. By this means a clue is furnished to the entire series of any man's publications, and also to a vast amount of the floating theological literature of our country. It is worthy of observation that a very large proportion of this literature, both in the present and in past generations, bears the stamp of polemics.

#### PIONEERS OF CIVILIZATION.

While it cannot be doubted that the great majority of the worthy pioneers of Christianity and civilization in our rapidly developed country are not admitted to the record of distinguished clergymen in any of the denominations, yet it is pleasant to find that so useful a class of ministers has excellent representatives even in the present volume.

In reference to a few from different sections of the country, and more especially those who endured the hardships incident to planting educational institutions in frontier settlements, we might mention Dr. WHEELOCK, founder of Dartmouth College, who

"In August, 1770, proceeded to Hanover, N. H., in order to make preparation for the immediate reception of his family and his pupils in the wilderness. The pine trees on a few acres had been cut down. Without nails or glass he built him a log-cabin, eighteen feet square, and directed the operations of forty or fifty laborers, who were employed in digging a well and building a house of one story for his family, and another of two stories, eighty feet long, for his scholars. As his family arrived, both these habitations were prepared. His wife and daughter lived for about a month in his hut, and his sons and students made them booths and beds of hemlock boughs. Almost immediately after they had become settled in their new habitation they experienced a precious visitation of the Holy Spirit, which was followed by extensive and permanently happy effects upon their little community. Dr. Wheelock lived to preside at eight commencements of the college, and conferred its honors on seventy-two young men, of whom thirty-nine became ministers of the Gospel."

One of Dr. Wheelock's pupils was the Rev. SAMUEL KIRKLAND, who became, in 1764, a missionary to the Indian tribes of Central New York, and who labored usefully among them forty years. One of the crowning labors of his life was the founding of an academy, which in due time became Hamilton College. Washington College, Tennessee, was founded under circumstances of great self-sacrifice on the part of the Rev. SAMUEL DOAK. REV. GIDEON BLACKBURN, a student of Dr. Doak, became still more celebrated for his labors and success in founding schools among the Cherokee Indians, and ultimately a theological seminary at Carlinville, Illinois. The labors of the venerable BISHOP CHASE in founding Kenyon College, at Gambier, Ohio, and subsequently Jubilee College, at Robin's Nest, Illinois, are also full of a certain melancholy interest.

#### COLORED PREACHERS.

It will be interesting to many to observe that among the "distinguished clergymen" of America are enumerated not less than three colored men, or those in whose veins flowed at least a large proportion of African blood. They are LEMUEL HAYNES, for many years the settled pastor of a Congregational church at West Rutland, Vt.; ANDREW MARSHALL, who was fifty years a slave, and fifty more pastor of a colored church in Savannah, Ga.; and LOTT CAREY, who was born a slave in Virginia, but who lived to be governor of the free colony of Liberia, and died universally respected and lamented as a philanthropist. The former two were of mixed blood; the latter, so far as the record shows, of pure African descent. The portraiture of each one is well drawn in the Annals.

#### USEFUL PASTORS.

We are obliged to confess that our search through the annals for examples of extraordinary usefulness in the pastoral office has not

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XII—30

been so amply rewarded as we could have desired. Examples of great interest and instructiveness there are. We may refer to those of Rev. A. HYDE, of Lee, Mass.; J. BUSHNELL, of Cornwall, Conn.; Dr. SPENCER, of Brooklyn, and Dr. MILNOR, of New York. That of Dr. BEDELL, of Philadelphia, is too instructive to be omitted.

"Dr. Bedell was remarkable for his talent in keeping up a large system of parochial operations, which embraced all the best methods of promoting Christian knowledge, a devotional spirit, and benevolent effort among his people, and also in getting their means and energies into active employment in good works; he himself being present and influential at all points, the head everywhere, keeping all in just subordination, guiding all with a shepherd's voice, full of work, and yet never seeming as if he were in the least encumbered or troubled with that which came upon him daily. His spirit was always on the alert. He *enjoyed* his labors. His cares were his delight. He served as a *son*, and, in that respect, a *servant* of God. The yoke was easy because he loved the work and the Master.

"He was much indebted for this ability to get through so much with so little wear of mind to his eminent habit of *order* and system. That habit appeared in all things, the smallest and the greatest. All were timed and placed, and came and went in rank and file. And a system once adopted was kept. He lost little time in passing from one occupation to the next. The connection was settled. How much time is often wasted and wear of mind incurred in our transactions in considering what we shall go at next."—*Bishop M'Ilvaine*.

Brief as is the above extract, it indicates the true elements of pastoral labor and success. They may be summed up in three words—devotion, industry, system. Without a heart-felt devotion to the work of the Lord and the welfare of his people, pastoral labor becomes intolerably irksome. With it nothing is more refreshing to the soul, however wearisome to the body. But as this is a work that never ends, even piety cannot accomplish it without industry, and industry itself will fail if developed only by impulses and without systematic and life-long perseverance.

#### PREACHERS AND PREACHING.

We must now pass to a principal object of the present paper, which is to show in a connected form the peculiar traits, as it respects preaching, of the leading pulpit orators of America. Such a design seems to us peculiarly appropriate to a notice of "Annals of the Pulpit." For whatever characteristics of greatness a minister of the Gospel may exhibit in collateral or subordinate relations, the sacredness of his vocation and the heaven-appointed design of his message alike demand his best efforts and his highest energies for the pulpit. The pulpit must be his throne of power. Through it he communicates face to face with dying men. Indifference in pulpit effort admits of no compensation. An opportunity of doing good by speaking forth the words of God once lost is lost forever.

Yet there are infinite diversities of pulpit gifts, and nearly equal differences of administrations, for the same spiritual result. It is extremely interesting to study the varieties of human talent as applied to this one great business of preaching. There is scarcely an object of beauty or sublimity in nature which has not its counterpart in the varied phases of human eloquence. The balmy zephyr, the rushing storm, the murmuring brook, the raging cataract, the modest violet, the stately oak, the refreshing dew, the rolling ocean, the sunlight and the darkness, each, all have their place in the gentle offices or the grand movements of the material universe. So in the world of mind God has given talents which in their appropriate action create influences as varied and yet as useful in their several spheres.

Inherently vicious therefore would be any system which should seek to recast all varieties of talent in one mould, or to reduce all preaching to a fixed and unalterable style. Nevertheless, while investigating the varieties of pulpit talent portrayed in the volumes before us, we have been not a little interested in certain points of resemblance between all the great orators of whatever denomination, and in all varieties of circumstances.

The one thing which has most excited our surprise, and at the same time confirmed our cherished theories of true pulpit eloquence, has been the discovery that even in denominations where the reading of sermons has been supposed to be the established law of custom, all the *most* distinguished and truly powerful preachers have cultivated habits of extemporaneous speech, and have accomplished their deepest impressions and largest usefulness by means of it. The prominent exhibition of this fact at this time we deem specially opportune.

Without adducing theory or labored argument on the subject, we propose to show what has been the practice of all, or nearly all of the most eloquent ministers of the four denominations represented in the Annals thus far published, not doubting that it will be confirmed by all subsequent records and investigations. Let it not be for one moment supposed that we would, by any citation or allusion, discourage ministers from writing sermons; on the other hand we commend the practice as an important means of mental discipline and of special preparation for preaching, and we doubt not that neglect of it is the prevalent fault of extemporaneous preachers. We object, however, *toto cælo*, to a servile dependence either on manuscripts or on memorization during the delivery of sermons. The whole man, mind and body, eye, tongue, brain, and soul, needs to be in harmonious, excited, and yet regulated action as a means of

communicating thought, feeling, and purpose to an auditory as well on religious as on other subjects. All great orators find out this necessity in one way or another, and it is one of the "undesigned coincidences" of the "*Annals of the American Pulpit*" that from hundreds of intelligent and chiefly clerical witnesses, writing, without any concert of purpose, respecting hundreds of different subjects in all possible varieties of circumstances, there has been put upon record a mass of evidence that cannot be without great weight in settling right convictions on this important subject. We shall not be supposed to intimate that every extemporaneous speaker is or can be a great orator, but we may safely urge that every candidate for the sacred office will be profited by the study of good examples.

For the sake of producing such examples in as great numbers as possible, we omit much of comment that it would be pertinent and pleasant to make. Although some advantages might be gained by a different arrangement, yet on the whole we think it best to follow the denominational and chronological order of the *Annals* themselves, more especially as it will contribute to the convenience of all readers who may wish to verify our references, or in the moment of excited curiosity to learn more of the character, habits, and history of the worthy men whom we shall bring to their attention. The extracts are of necessity brief, relating chiefly to two points, the celebrity of the preacher and his manner of preaching. On these points sentences are combined at pleasure from various parts of the several notices.

#### TRINITARIAN CONGREGATIONAL.

JOHN DAVENPORT, 1637-1672.

Mr. Davenport was successively a graduate of Oxford, a minister of St. Stephen's Church, London, chaplain or patriarch of the colony of New Haven, and minister of the First Church, Boston.

Dr. Bacon says of him :

"Instead of being, as his weaker cotemporaries were prone to be, a slave to the technicalities of the art, he used them as easily as an expert workman uses the tools of his trade. None in a debate could better state the point in question, none could detect more promptly or expose more strikingly the fallacious statements or the inconclusive arguments of an opponent. His various stores of knowledge afforded him at need those ready and lively illustrations which are often more effective than dry argument can be.

"His sermons, as he prepared them for the pulpit, appear to have been not discourses fully written out, after the manner now adopted by the most accomplished New England preachers, but outlines, with somewhat extended sketches of the leading topics, to be completed and enlivened by the freedom and fire of extemporaneous utterance. Hence we can only very imperfectly judge of his power in the pulpit by any specimens of his preaching which have come down to us. A person who in his youth was the particular friend of Davenport the aged says, 'He was a princely preacher.'"



JOSEPH BELLAMY, D. D., 1737-1790.

Of this celebrated New England divine his biographer says:

"He adapted himself with great felicity to the state of the times; and while he resembled Whitefield in the abundance of his preaching he was not unlike him in respect to fervor and aptness, and he greatly exceeded him in discrimination and logic. Dr. Bellamy's preaching was generally from short notes, was of a remarkably discriminating character, and was alike adapted to awaken the careless, and to keep before the minds of his hearers what he regarded as the scriptural test of Christian experience. In his manner of preaching he was to be reckoned among the sons of thunder. With a prodigious voice, vivid imagination, great flow of language, and a deep sense of the importance of his message, he spoke like one having authority, and rarely failed to secure an earnest attention."

JOSEPH HUNTINGTON, D. D., 1763-1794.

"Dr. Huntington was undoubtedly one of the most popular preachers of his day. He spoke extemporaneously, seldom writing more than a skeleton, or the principal topics of his discourse."

CHARLES BACKUS, D. D., 1773-1803.

"His high reputation as a theologian procured for him invitations to occupy the theological chair in two of our colleges, Dartmouth and Yale. His sermons were well studied. He always preached with animation and power, especially when he preached extempore."

SAMUEL SPRING, D. D., 1774-1819.

According to the testimony of the late Dr. Woods, of Andover:

"Dr. Spring was powerful in the pulpit. As a preacher he was remarkable for a clear and forcible illustration of divine truth, and a faithful and unsparing application of it to his hearers. His written sermons were prepared with care and labor, and were always weighty and instructive. But his extemporaneous preaching was far more striking and powerful. It was here that he showed his superior strength to the best advantage."

TIMOTHY DWIGHT, D. D., 1777-1817.

"Though he preached regularly twice on the Sabbath, while in Greenfield, it was generally from short notes; and it was his own opinion that his preaching then was more effective than when, in subsequent life, and upon a change of circumstances, he wrote out his sermons and read them as they were written."

The late Rev. N. W. Taylor, D. D., says of Dr. Dwight:

"I do not think his powers as an extempore preacher were fully appreciated. I might assign the reasons for this. But without prolonging this detail, I will only say that on some few occasions I have heard him in an off-hand speech surpassingly eloquent, far exceeding anything in himself when preaching his most eloquent written discourses."

EDWARD PAYSON, D. D., 1807-1827.

"Dr. Payson's sermons, which are already before the public, show the richness and fertility of his mind, his deep knowledge of the Scriptures and experience of the truth, his faithfulness, his happy, various, and brilliant powers of

illustration, and deeply earnest and evangelical tone of his ministry; and there is enough of feeling and emotion in the printed sermons themselves to indicate that the living man who uttered them was by no means confined to his manuscript. Their delivery must have been attended with many of those extemporaneous effusions and impulsive appeals which render the words of the living preacher so much more interesting and effective than the reading of his book."—DR. A. PETERS.

Payson himself has left on record (see his *Memoirs*) the conviction, that of the good done under his preaching, the most was apparently attributable to his extemporaneous lectures and addresses.

ASAHEL NETTLETON, D. D., 1811–1844.

Few men have been more celebrated among the Congregationalists for pungency and power in the pulpit than Dr. Nettleton. Of his preaching it is said, "It was for the most part extemporaneous, though his mind had always been filled with the subject from previous study."

#### PRESBYTERIAN.

The number of Presbyterian clergymen whose experience and example illustrate our theory is very considerable. We may mention as worthy of notice the names of JAMES WADDELL, the blind preacher of Virginia, so graphically described by William Wirt, and JAMES TURNER, of whom Dr. Plumer says: "I would readily travel a hundred miles to hear such a sermon as either of those I heard from him. I have never seen any man sway an audience as he did. Old and young, learned and unlearned, saint and sinner, the white man and the black man, felt and owned his power."

Of the senior Dr. ALEXANDER, of Princeton, Dr. Hall remarks: "As is often the case with the most effective preachers, no printed sermons of Dr. A.'s can give any adequate conception of the interest which belonged to their delivery, especially when he preached without a manuscript." Dr. Boardman and others make similar remarks; but by far the most full and satisfactory accounts of Dr. Alexander's habits and views of preaching are given in his life, written by his son, the late Dr. J. W. Alexander. They are worthy of special attention.

JOHN M. MASON, D. D., 1792–1829.

The celebrated Dr. Mason, of New York, having graduated at Columbia College, pursued a course of theological study at the University of Edinburgh. His biographer says:

"One of the most important advantages which he seems to have derived from his connection with the university, was the admirable facility which he

acquired at extemporaneous speaking. . . . He ultimately attained a rank among the first extemporaneous preachers of the age."

Rev. Dr. M'Cartee gives the following recollections of Dr. Mason as a preacher :

"No mere verbal description can convey to those who never saw Dr. Mason an adequate idea of what he was as a preacher. With reference to his manner of speaking, I may state that no one was ever less indebted to the tricks of oratory for his power over his audience. Some preachers are great only on great occasions. They need some rousing question or some rare event to excite or to concentrate their energies. What Dr. Mason could do under excitements of this sort, his orations on the death of Washington and of Hamilton, and his sermon entitled 'Messiah's Throne,' sufficiently discover; but I think that he delivered discourses not less masterly and eloquent than the very best of his published ones in the ordinary course of his ministry. He told me that, in the earlier part of his ministry, his habit was to write the introduction and the application of his sermons with great care, and then to commit them perfectly to memory. But in later years (except the very last of his ministry) his numerous duties forbade his making even this kind of preparation for the pulpit; and if he had not been compelled by the importunity of friends to reduce to writing what he had already preached, some of his most admired sermons would have been lost forever.

"Toward the close of his life the failure of memory consequent upon the disease which paralyzed mind and body, obliged him to write his sermons and even to read them. It was not without a severe mental struggle that he consented to put on this ignoble yoke as he viewed it, for he had all the old Scottish prejudices against 'readers of the Gospel,' and had said as hard things about them as any one. The first time he preached for me in this way was in Spruce-street, Philadelphia, where he knew the people had an especial dislike of 'the paper.' He laid his notes on the Bible, and then said: 'My friends, I must ask your indulgence for adopting to-day a practice which through life I have condemned. I must read my sermon; the hand of God is upon me; I must bow to his will.' I need not say that the bitterest haters of 'notes' in the audience were melted, and for a time the Church was truly a Bochim."

GEORGE ADDISON BAXTER, D.D., 1797-1841.

"When he first began to prepare for public life he suffered not a little inconvenience from an impediment in his speech; but this he overcame by accustoming himself to declaim, after the manner of the great Grecian model, with pebbles in his mouth, and in the noise of waterfalls. So completely was this difficulty removed that, in later life, one of the most remarkable things in his delivery was its perfect ease and freedom; and so far from feeling the fatigue, after preaching, of which most ministers are wont to complain, he actually found himself invigorated by that kind of effort for a journey or any other unusual exertion."

Doctor B. was for many years connected with Washington Academy, afterward College, Virginia. In 1831 he was appointed Professor of Theology in the Union Theological Seminary.

"On all sides Dr. Baxter seems to have been admitted to be a truly great man. His power of condensation was remarkable. A few words availed with him more than many with most other speakers or writers. After what has just been stated, it seems almost superfluous to say that Dr. Baxter was what

is usually termed an *extempore* preacher. He probably never had a manuscript sermon in the pulpit in his life; and in all the preaching which I ever heard from him, I never saw him with the briefest outline committed to paper. His pulpit preparations were nevertheless thorough."

JOHN BRODHEAD ROMEYN, 1798-1825.

Dr. Romeyn was made for the pulpit. All his natural tastes and mental training seemed to have peculiar reference to that sphere. As a preacher he stood eminent, in some respects "*primus inter pares*," among the great lights our city could boast at that day. His discourses in the early part of his ministry were generally written out; but in later years he was accustomed to leave large chasms in his manuscript to be filled up by the suggestions of the moment, and these extemporaneous parts of his sermon often produced the greatest effect."

HENRY KOLLOCK, D.D., 1800-1819.

"Dr. Kollock's eloquence was the unique, living expression of what he believed, approved, and felt on some great subject. His written discourses were excellent compositions, and he sometimes pronounced them with astonishing effect; but his brightest efforts of eloquence were purely extempore."—*Bishop Capers*.

At this point, for lack of space, we are compelled to omit extracts after the plan we had designed to follow, and to limit our references to a bare enumeration of names, such as those of GIDEON BLACKBURN, JAMES LAURIE, JOHN HOLT RICE, SYLVESTER LARNED, DAVID NELSON, DANIEL LYNN CARROLL, WILLIAM S. POTTS, and JAMES PATRIOT WILSON. Having noticed the scholarship of Dr. Wilson, we cannot forbear to add the following paragraph from Dr. Sprague's memoir:

"I heard him preach one sermon, and it was throughout as consecutive and condensed as the demonstration of a problem of Euclid. I am confident that I never heard another preacher who tasked my powers of attention and reflection so much. The loss of a sentence or two would have greatly marred the impression of the entire discourse. He spoke without notes and with great deliberation, but with as much correctness as if every word had been written. On a blank leaf of his copy of Henry Ware's Tract on 'Extemporaneous Preaching,' he has left the following testimony over his signature: 'I have preached twenty years, and have never written a full sermon in my life, and never read one word of a sermon from the pulpit, nor opened a note, nor committed a sentence, and have rarely wandered five minutes at a time from my mental arrangement previously made.'"

EPISCOPALIAN.

Rather singularly, as it will seem to most readers, the first name of any great celebrity in the volume devoted to the biography of Episcopal ministers is that of GEORGE WHITEFIELD. His fame as a preacher and his habits of effective extemporaneous speech are so well known that no space need here be taken to exhibit them.

In this connection may be enumerated the honored names of DEVERAUX JARRATT, JOSEPH PILMORE, RICHARD CHANNING

MOORE, BISHOP HENSHAW, DR. BEDELL, and DR. REUEL KEITH.  
The example of the latter is eminently instructive :

"As an extemporaneous preacher Dr. K. had few superiors. He often wrote his sermons in full, and delivered them with great power ; but his unwritten sermons were still more acceptable, and evidently more effective. He never was willing, however, to preach without careful preparation, as he once said, when, declining to preach on the following Sunday, he was still urged to preach an extempore sermon : ' Ah ! if a written sermon would do I might draw on old stores ; but if you want an *extempore* sermon, I must have a *week* to get ready.

"Dr. Keith stood very high as a preacher. It is the opinion of a clerical brother, who has had every opportunity and qualification for forming a sound opinion in the case, that he was the most acceptable preacher that attended the Episcopal conventions of Virginia."

The following additional statement of Dr. Keith's son, a missionary in China, should prove a great encouragement to all who encounter difficulties in acquiring the habit of extempore address :

"His difficulty of speaking extempore in the early part of his ministry was so great that he had actually been known to give up the attempt, and sit down in silent defeat. But some of the extemporaneous efforts of his later years were, in the judgment of his friends, among the best he ever put forth."

#### BAPTIST.

Nearly all the great lights among the Baptists of America, as well as of England, may be named as examples of extemporaneous preachers. We take pleasure in referring to the memoirs of SAMUEL STILLMAN, JAMES MANNING, HEZEKIAH SMITH, THOMAS BALDWIN, ANDREW BROADDUS, JONATHAN MAXCEY, WILLIAM STAUGHTON, also Doctors CONE, MAGINNIS, TUCKER, RHEES, and several others.

In conclusion, on the subject of preaching—that all-important work of the Christian minister—we need only say that if examples can teach, the present and future generations of ministers need not remain uninstructed in both the principles and the practice essential to an effective proclamation of the word of God. From the examples cited, as well as similar ones that have been given in other countries and times, we think the following conclusions irresistible :

1. That habits of extemporaneous speech should be cultivated and practiced by preachers of the Gospel as the most efficient and impressive mode of addressing their fellow-men.
2. That diligent, systematic, and laborious preparation, by means both of study and writing, is quite as essential to high success in this style of preaching as in any other.
3. That every speaker should seek to develop his own peculiar gifts for sacred oratory without servile imitation of any human being.

4. That whatever natural talents or acquired graces any one may possess, he cannot expect to succeed in winning souls to Christ without the blessing of God and the constant aid of the Holy Spirit.

---

#### ART. IX.—THE APOSTLES' CREED.

IN all ages of the Church great respect has been paid to the Apostles' Creed. St. Augustin calls it, "The illumination of the soul, the perfection of believers, by which the bond of infidelity is dissolved, the gate of life is opened, and the glory of faith is shown; little indeed in words, but great in mysteries; short, so as not to oppress the memory, yet comprehensive, so as to exceed the understanding. Worthily, therefore, is this Creed to be attended unto, since whatsoever is prefigured in the patriarchs, declared in the Scriptures, or foretold in the prophets concerning the blessed TRINITY and the mystery of our SAVIOUR's incarnation, death, and crucifixion, is contained in it." By Irenæus, Tertullian, and Jerome, the Creed is styled "the rule of faith and truth."

At an early period the Apostles' Creed was called a *symbol*, and studiously concealed from the pagan world, and not revealed to the Catechumens until just before their *baptism*, or initiation into the Christian mysteries; then it was delivered to them as that secret mark or token by which the faithful in all parts of the world should know each other and be known.

We have abundant proof that the Creed was carefully kept from the knowledge of the profane and unbelieving. Cyprian assures us that "the sacrament of faith, that is, the Creed, was not to be profaned or divulged; for which he cites two texts of Scripture, the one, Proverbs xxiii, 9: 'Speak not in the ears of a fool, for he will despise the wisdom of thy words;' and the other, Matthew vii, 6: 'Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you.'" St. Ambrose advises the utmost vigilance to conceal the Christian mysteries, and to be very "careful not by incautiousness to reveal the secrets of the Creed or the Lord's prayer."

With respect to the author of the Apostles' Creed, or the time of its composition, we can obtain but little satisfactory information. Its title and early tradition assign the authorship to the apostles



themselves. In the fourth century Ambrose declares that the twelve apostles, as skillful artificers, assembled together and made a key by their common advice, that is, the Creed, by which the darkness of the devil is disclosed that the light of Christ may appear." Some of the fathers allege that each member of the apostolic college inserted a particular article, and thus the Creed was divided into twelve parts. One tradition declared that Peter said, "I believe in God the Father almighty;" John, "maker of heaven and earth;" James, "and in Jesus Christ, his only son, our Lord;" Andrew, "who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary;" Philip, "suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried;" Thomas, "he descended into hell, the third day he rose again from the dead;" Bartholomew, "he ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God, the Father almighty;" Matthew, "from thence shall he come to judge the quick and the dead;" James, the son of Alphaeus, "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy catholic Church;" Simon Zelotes, "the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins;" Jude, the brother of James, "the resurrection of the body;" Matthias, "life everlasting. Amen."

This tradition cannot be true, because it was nearly four hundred years *after* CHRIST before the framing of the Creed by the apostles was heard of. It is also historically certain that several of the articles attributed to them formed no part of it during the three first centuries. These were "the descent into hell," and the "communion of saints." A venerable authority informs us that "the descent into hell" was neither in the Roman nor Oriental creeds.\* "The communion of saints" was not in any creed till above four hundred years after Christ, and then not immediately received in all. The clause of "life everlasting" was omitted in several, while in others it was inserted.

Thus, although no reliance can be placed on the tradition of the apostolic authorship of the Creed, still it originated in the earlier ages of Christianity. Irenæus was born A. D. 97, and was the scholar of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, and repeats a creed not much unlike the apostles'. He also declares that the Church dispersed throughout the whole world had received this faith from the apostles and their disciples. This celebrated father and bishop further says: "This faith the Church guards carefully, *as if she dwelt in one house, believes, as if she had but one soul, and proclaims, teaches, and delivers, as if she possessed but one mouth.*"

The Creed doubtless obtained its distinctive title because it was universally received as the best summary of the facts and doctrines

\* Rufinus.

which constituted the subject of apostolic preaching. It was regarded also as requisite to be believed by all converts to Christianity, and all who took upon themselves its holy profession. So it early became the Creed of Christendom, and still continues to be. The primitive fathers took extraordinary care to conceal the Creed, keeping it from the knowledge not only of the heathen but also the catechumens. They even scrupled to commit it to writing, choosing rather to transmit the sacred articles to posterity by tradition, as they called it, the "*tradition of faith*." Jerome asserts "that this symbol of our faith and hope, delivered by the apostles, was not written in paper and ink, but in the fleshly tables of the heart;" and another father exhorts his hearers to preserve this gift in the most inward recesses of their hearts, not to permit vile paper to depreciate this precious gift, or black ink to darken this mystery of light." There are numerous similar passages as evidence of the strange disposition to keep the Creed secret among the early Christians.

Although we do not know who were its authors, still it is evident the Creed was not the work of one man, or composed at the same moment. We presume that some of its articles were derived from the days of the apostles themselves, while others were afterward added by the primitive Church, to oppose errors and heresies that had sprung up. We know that the first apostles and evangelists who preached the Gospel in the Jewish and pagan world received converts into the Church by baptism. Then their assent to the Christian faith was demanded; and we have an example in Acts viii, after the conference between Philip and the eunuch. The latter desired to be baptized, when the evangelist told him, *that if he did believe with all his heart he might*. The eunuch replied, "that he did believe Jesus Christ to be the SON OF GOD," on which Philip baptized him, *not before*.

This apostolical confession at baptism was not at that early period committed to writing, but intrusted to the officers of every Church, to preserve undefiled, and use as the terms of Christianity and admission to their communion. Some imagine that St. Paul had this in view when he exhorted Timothy "to keep that which was committed to his trust," and "to hold fast the form of sound words." Rufinus states that in his days "the ancient custom was retained at Rome for persons to be baptized publicly to recite the Creed." Athanasius relates that those who came to the sacred laver of regeneration confessed, saying, "I believe in God the Father almighty, and in Jesus Christ his only Son, and in the Holy Ghost." Long before either of these fathers, Justin Martyr, who was martyred about A. D. 165, assures us that "none were baptized unless

they did first declare their assent to the doctrine and faith of the Gospel."

In the apostolic ages several heresies arose in the Church, and were very detrimental to her best interests; and to prevent their fatal tendencies, as well as to hinder heretics from uniting with the orthodox Christians, the fundamental truths of the Christian faith were inserted in the Creed.

Thus did the early Christians respect and reverence the Apostles' Creed; and later, for several centuries, it was not only used at baptism, but usually read as the standard and basis of the *Christian faith*, the congregation testifying their commendation by saying, AMEN.

Timothy, Archbishop of Constantinople, about the year A. D. 521, appointed the reading of the Creed at every assembly in the Eastern Church; and the Bishop of Antioch, at the same time, also prescribed "the perpetual recital of the Creed at the public administration of divine service." Before that time, an early historian observes, "it was only repeated on the day immediately preceding Good Friday, when the catechisms were more solemnly performed in order to the celebration of baptism the Easter or the Easter-eve ensuing."

At a synod of thirty-five bishops in the Western Churches, held under Alaricus, in Languedoc, it was ordained: "On the Lord's day before Easter, the Creed should be publicly preached in the Church to the competitors, or to those of the catechumens who, being ripe for baptism, were speedily to be admitted thereunto." Still its constant reading did not become general in the West until nearly six hundred years after Christ, when all the Churches of Spain and Galicia were instructed to repeat the Creed "with a loud voice every Lord's day, that so the true faith might be manifested and assented to, and the hearts of the people being purified by faith, they might be prepared to partake of the body and blood of Christ."

The creed here referred to was the *Nicene*, or Constantinopolitan, which for some reasons peculiar to that age was preferred to the Apostles'; still the last soon recovered its former use and value, and for ages has been esteemed the most venerable and divine. All others, with the exception of the Nicene, and that ascribed to Athanasius, have long since ceased to be used. Thus has the Apostles' Creed, in the providence of God, been honored of him.

"*I believe in God.*" These first words of the Apostles' Creed, expressing the *existence* of God, and the *unity* of the GODHEAD, lie at the foundation of everything sacred and of religion. St. Paul declares that "he that cometh unto God must *believe that he is.*"

In all the Eastern creeds the language is, "I believe in ONE GOD the Father;" and so it is with most primitive creeds, whether Latin or Greek. There is a peculiar force in the expression *one God*, in contradiction to the errors of some men who at that day wickedly opposed this vital sentiment of our holy religion, the unity of the divine essence.

These opposers could not have been the Jews, for the unity of the Godhead is everywhere inculcated in the Mosaic law. In all their captivity and dispersion, throughout hundreds of years, they have never deserted this great principle; and in their thirteen articles of faith, composed by Maimonides, the second is the "*unity of the blessed God*." In their hymns, published as early as 1642, we find this chorus often repeated: "All creatures, both above and below, testify and witness all of them as one, that the Lord is *one* and his name *ONE*."

The apostles and first preachers of the Gospel carefully warned the heathen converts against *polytheism*, directing them to the belief and worship of the true and only God. St. Paul and Barnabas exhorted the Lycaonians to turn from the idolatrous worship of Jupiter and Mercury unto the living God, "who made heaven, and earth, the sea, and all things that are therein."

Heresies, doubtless, were the principal cause of the first article in the Creed. In the earliest ages of the Church there were such, and their leaders, Irenæus declares, "were all disciples and successors of that first grand heretic, Simon Magus. Among these false leaders were the *Gnostics*, professed Christians of the first and second centuries, who held two principles, the one *good* and the other *evil*. They supposed the soul to be the substance of God, but denied the divinity of Christ, saying that God only dwelt and acted within him; not unlike some fashionable Unitarians of our day. Some imagine this heresy to have arisen in the apostles' time, and that St. Paul alludes to it in 1 Tim. vi, 20: "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and opposition of science falsely so called." In the dialogues of Origen, a disputant for this sect affirms "matter to be co-eternal with God;" another "that matter was co-eternal with the Lord; that it was neither born nor made, but was without beginning and end."

This doctrine would really make two gods. How false and absurd! Origen mentions another faction of the heretics, which affirm that "there were three principles: the first the good God, who was the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; the second the creator of the world, and the third the devil. We doubt not that these impious doctrines may be traced to Simon Magus, for an

early writer (Epiphanius) positively declares, that the author of two eternal principles, a good and a bad one, went to Jerusalem about the days of the apostles, and there disputed with the elders about the unity of the Godhead and the creation of the world. This, doubtless, was Magus, the father of the heretics, and his blasphemy; and there was great need of inserting in the early Christian creed the belief of ONE GOD, the same divine being who was the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth.

Next in the Apostles' Creed, after the existence and unity of God, follows that relation in which he stands to us as our Father, as he is also the author and origin of all being. The Gnostics, with other heretics, denied that God made the earth with its various creatures, and hence refused to attribute unto HIM this title of father.

"I believe in God the Father *Almighty*," is the well-known language of the Creed, and the word almighty meets these heresies, and declares our belief in the omnipotent power and operation of God to create the world out of nothing. Neither stood HE in need of any help from angels, or any other beings, to accomplish the glorious work. The word *almighty* also signifies the immensity and omnipresence of God; his power is omnipotent, his dominion universal, and his essence infinite. Thus, when we recite this clause in the Creed, "Maker of heaven and earth," we profess our belief of these great truths, in the only eternal and supreme God, who alone created and formed all things, both visible and invisible.

The Nicene, with the more ancient Greek creeds, read, and "in one Jesus Christ;" and the Church very early inserted in the rule of faith this proper antidote against a fatal error, which separated Christ from Jesus. This heresy denied the unity of our Saviour's person, creating two distinct and different persons, not one Christ Jesus, as the Creed declares.

In the Creed, the Son of God is first described by his name Jesus, and then by his office, that he is Christ, and afterward by his divine and human nature. Jesus was a proper name, and given to others besides our Saviour. Joshua, the son of Nun, was called Jesus. In Colossians we read of "Jesus who was called Justus;" and in the Acts, "of Bar-jesus, or the son of Jesus." When we repeat the words of the Creed, "in Jesus Christ," we declare our sincere belief in *Jesus of Nazareth*, CHRIST the anointed, and *Messias*. He was called Christ from anointing, because the unction, which by a figure formerly ran upon prophets, priests, and kings, the Divine Spirit poured in perfect fullness on this King of kings, priests, and prophets. David and Christ were both anointed, the one by man and the other by the Father, in an incomprehensible

manner. The Psalmist styles it "the oil of gladness above thy fellows," and this oil was the Holy Ghost.

After our Saviour's name and office there follows in the Apostles' Creed his sonship, which expresses his divine name, nothing human or common, but divinity proper and peculiar to him, and not attributable to any other. He is the Son of the Father, and his only Son, and in such a manner as any other never was or ever can be.

Christ's sonship is a sublime and incomprehensible mystery, a divine secret. To dive into it men may pretend to learning and knowledge, but betray their presumption and ignorance. The pious and humble will not search after things too difficult and too high for human comprehension. Speaking of Christ, the prophet, under the influence of the Holy Ghost, asks, "*Who shall declare his generation?*" We shall not attempt it, but remain thankful, assured, and contented that Christ was not only man because the Son of man, but also God, *because the SON of GOD.*

Following the divine nature of our Saviour, there comes in the Creed his *dominion*, expressed by the title LORD, and he is frequently called by this name in the New Testament. The Scriptures, too, are filled with the declarations of Christ's dominion; his empire is universal, and his kingdom everlasting. "His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Dan. vii. 14. He is King and Lord over all.

But he is "*our Lord*," is the language of the Creed. Christ and the devil have opposing kingdoms, and this warfare is perpetual and untiring. St. John declares "that the whole world lieth in wickedness;" but our Saviour came to erect an opposite kingdom to Satan's, and invites all men to become his subjects. The formal admission into its blessed privileges was baptism, when the baptized openly renounced the rule of the evil one, submitting himself to Jesus Christ, his Lord and Governor. To this hour, converts to Christianity, at their baptism, do the same act, for there is but "one LORD, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all." Eph. iv. 5, 6.

The divine nature and godship of our Saviour having been declared, the Creed next affirms his *humanity*. He was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary. By this, and the following expressions are avowed the reality and manner of his *incarnation*, that the Son of God did, for man and our salvation, become the Son of man, not disdaining to take on him the seed of Abraham, sin alone excepted.

In the apostles' as well as our days, there are those who reject



this truth of the *incarnation*. The *Corinthians* especially embraced this heresy, and allowed that our Saviour was born in the ordinary way, like other men, but denied his conception by the Holy Ghost. Corinthus, who was a kind of early Unitarian, defended this heresy, and it was the occasion, it is imagined, of St. John's writing his Gospel. The *Corinthians* published these doctrines even in the time of the apostles, asserting that *Jesus*, and *Christ* were distinct persons—Jesus the son of Mary and Joseph, and Christ came down to dwell in *Jesus* at the time of his baptism, and left him at the time of his passion. Hence they contended that Christ did not suffer, but *Jesus* only. They also rejected the *Acts* of the Apostles and the *Epistles* of St. Paul against these fatal errors. This extraordinary way of our Saviour's conception and nativity was inserted in the Creed.

Our Saviour's passion was likewise introduced for the same object, for it was attacked by these same heretics. The sufferings and passion of Christ form so convincing an argument of his real incarnation, that it is hard to imagine how any one could withstand its force and truth. To our mind, the passion of the world's Redeemer is a most convincing argument to prove the certainty of his incarnation. That all doubt or cavils might be removed, the authors of the Creed have taken care to mention the *time* of the passion, "under Pontius Pilate." The ancient Churches were most exact on this point, for there is scarcely a creed extant that does not expressly mention our Saviour's sufferings *under Pontius Pilate*.

To the passion of our Saviour is added its particular manner—his *crucifixion*. He was nailed to the cross, and hung between the heavens and the earth in an open place, where all might see that it was Jesus of Nazareth, and not Simon the Cyrenian, as some early scoffers wickedly asserted. Our Lord was not only crucified, but he died the common death. Well might this great truth be inserted in the Apostles' Creed; for if Christ did not die, and could not die, our faith is in vain, and we cannot be saved. This belief is the well-known chief corner-stone of the blessed Gospel.

According to the universal law of nature our Saviour died, and his body was committed to the grave, destitute of motion and breath, wrapped in a linen cloth; it was laid in a tomb, secured by a stone with the seals of those who rolled it on. Thus the Lord Jesus expired on the cross, and suffered the dissolution of soul and body. By his personal endurance he can sanctify every state and condition to all his faithful members. He permitted his body,

like unto ours, to be committed to the earth, and buried in a grave, while his soul fled to the invisible world, or, as it is expressed in the next article of the Creed, "*He descended into hell.*"

This is a most noted sentence from the various interpretations that have been given to it, which are so multiplied that we cannot, in an article like the present, even enumerate them. "*Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell*" is the language of the Scriptures, (Acts xi, 27;) and *εἰς ᾗδου*, in *hades*, is the Greek word rendered *hell*. In the original it means the state of *separate spirits*, or the state of the *dead*. Among the Greeks *hades* was a general term expressing this state; it was *Tartarus* to the wicked and *Elysium* to the good. Scholars are not agreed as to its true interpretation, and the article itself had no existence prior to the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, or the second General Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381. The creed of this last body was incorporated into the liturgy of the Church of England and of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, under the name of the *Nicene Creed*. The article appears to have been *first* introduced into the Apostles' Creed of the Church of Aquileia about the year A. D. 400, but not generally adopted by the Church until the seventh century. At the Reformation the Church of England made the descent one of the articles of religion, during the reign of Edward VI., and it was re-affirmed in 1562, during the time of Elizabeth. The Churches then expounded the *descent* of our Saviour *into hell* as meaning his preaching to the spirits who were in prison, or in hell.

Among the acts of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, 1785, was one expunging from the Creed the descent of Christ into hell. That Church had not then been organized, and when the proposed omission was considered by the English bishops they ordered it to be restored. In the General Convention of 1786 these views were subject to a searching criticism, when after a warm debate the clause was reinstated. In 1789, when Bishops White and Provost were consecrated, the Book of Common Prayer was subjected to final revision, and another discussion arose concerning the *descent*. Then it was ordered to be printed in italics and between brackets, with a rubric, permitting in its stead the use of the words "He went into the place of departed spirits." In 1792, when the General Convention met again, this subject came up a third time, and an unsuccessful attempt was made to have the article expunged altogether. It was now resolved to print the Creed in all future editions of the Prayer Books, with the article inserted, not in italics and brackets as before, but with a rubric, leaving it discretionary for the Churches to use the expression or not, or to use

in its stead: "He went into the place of departed spirits." (*Journal of Convention.*)

The Methodist Episcopal Church has an interest in this investigation, for our own XXV Articles of Religion were selected by Mr. Wesley from the XXXIX of the Church of England. Thus are we nearly allied to each other by common and vital Christian principles. Calvin first proposed a metaphorical interpretation of "the descent into Hell," referring it neither to the body or the soul of Christ in the intermediate state, but to a period *antecedent* to his death. It describes figuratively his extreme mental sufferings and agony in the garden and on the cross. This view for a time was very prevalent in the Reformed Churches. The Heidelberg Catechism, published in 1563, which is the manual for the German and Dutch Reformed Churches, expresses the same view. It asks: "Why is there added 'He descended into hell?'" Answer. That I may be assured and wholly comfort myself in this: that my Lord Jesus Christ, by his inexpressible anguish, pains, terrors, and hellish agonies, but especially on the cross, hath delivered me from the anguish and torments of hell." The words taken by themselves and *per se* will bear this construction of Calvin; but this cannot be their meaning in the Apostles' Creed. The connection forbids it, the clause coming *after* the burial and *before* the resurrection; doctrinally it has no scriptural basis to rest upon. Where is it said in God's word that our Saviour suffered the torments of the damned on the cross, or in the abode of lost spirits? It seems impossible to us that he could have suffered them. His sinless soul suffering remorse of conscience! that awful ingredient in the pains of the lost!

Some suppose that the descent of Christ into hell imports that *Christ descended into the place of future punishment—Gehenna.* This view prevailed extensively during the Middle Ages, connected with the doctrine of *purgatory*; but no respectable writer now advocates it as thus explained. In the Book of Common Prayer, published during the reign of Edward, A. D. 1552, the third article of religion reads: "As Christ died for us and was buried, so also it is to be believed that he went down into hell; for his body lay in the grave till his resurrection, but his soul, being separate from his body, remained with the spirits which were detained in prison; that is to say, in hell, and there preached unto them." The following year, in the Short Catechism, set forth by royal authority, the descent is thus explained: "Forasmuch as not only the living but the dead, were they in hell or elsewhere, they all felt the power and force of his death, to whom, lying in prison, (as Peter saith,) Christ preached,

though dead in body, yet relieved in spirit." Ten years afterward, (1562,) in a synod during the time of Elizabeth, this explanatory clause was stricken out. The precise import of Christ's descent has ever since remained an open question in the Church of England. Bishop Beveridge, in his exposition of the XXXIX Articles, advocates this extreme view, and it must be confessed that the language, construed according to its ordinary use in our day, implies two things: 1. That our Saviour, as to his human soul, went to the place of punishment. 2. This place of punishment, or hell, is situated beneath the earth. This meaning every English reader would plainly put upon it. The Saxon word *hell* doubtless was employed originally in the comprehensive sense of the Greek, *hades*, and was adopted to represent it. In the translation of the Scriptures hell is used to signify the grave, the general state of the dead, while in the New Testament it means the region of the impenitent and lost. The word has ceased to be used in the wide sense once attached to it, and is now employed specifically to designate the place of future punishment to the wicked. We need only add that the descent of Christ into hell, as thus explained, is now abandoned, and we know no careful writer who advocates this extreme opinion.

There is another interpretation of the descent of Christ into hell, and it deserves particular notice. This is the theory: there is a *third place* for departed spirits in the invisible world, and distinct from heaven and hell. The place is called *sheol* in Hebrew, in Greek *hades*, and in Latin *infernus orcus*, and situated beneath the surface or at the very center of the earth. Here the disembodied, whether good or bad, remain during the intermediate state, and enjoy comparative happiness or endure comparative misery. They will leave this temporary abode at the general resurrection, and reuniting to their former bodies, will either ascend to heaven or depart to hell (*gehenna*) according to the decisions of the final judgment. This abode has two different compartments, but separated by an impassible gulf, one called *Paradise* and Abraham's bosom, the abode of the pious; and the other *Tartarus*, the abyss, or *gehenna*, the place of the ungodly. Here it is alleged that the rational soul of our Saviour descended and remained in that department of *hades* occupied by the pious dead.

In recent times Bishop Horsley embraced this theory,\* and Bishop Hobart advocated it in a *Dissertation on the State of the Departed*, published in 1816. "He descended," says Horsley, "to hell, properly so called, to the invisible mansion of departed spirits,

\* *Vide* Sermons, published in 1810.

and to that part of it where the souls of the faithful, when they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity." It is not our object critically to examine this theory. To those desiring such a view the following are the five passages of Scripture chiefly relied upon to sustain it: *Psa. xvi, 9; Luke xxiii, 43; xvi, 23, 24; Eph. iv, 9, 10; Peter iii, 18-20.* "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption." *Psa. xvi, 9.* This is the principal passage, if not the only one, on which the article of Christ's descent into hell was originally founded. Its meaning (*ἀδης*) is the only question, and in its most comprehensive sense it includes the entire domain of death. It occurs sixty-four times in the Old Testament, and in several instances is used with special reference to the locality of the body, or the *grave*, the *sepulcher*. The learned translators of our authorized version in thirty-one instances have rendered it *grave*, and in three (*Num. xvi, 30, 31; Job xvii, 16*) *pit*.

"The third day he rose from the dead." This is the next article in the Apostles' Creed, and its certainty is absolutely necessary to the Christian religion. Thus far we have contemplated our Redeemer in his humanity and humiliation. His glorious exaltation follows, and the Sun of righteousness now rises with brightest light and splendor. The great blessing which the Gospel promises is the remission of sins, and the certainty of the gracious assurance depended upon our Saviour's resurrection. "He was delivered for our offenses, so he was raised again for our justification." Hence St. Paul argues: "If Christ had not risen our faith is in vain; we are yet in our sins." Well may we conclude that the resurrection of Christ had a place in the Creed from the commencement of Christianity. Indeed, this was the peculiar design of the apostles' office, "to be intercessors of Christ's resurrection." In the religion of nature the belief in God is fundamental; in the religion of the Jews that Moses was a prophet, and received the law from God; and in the Christian religion the resurrection of our Saviour, is a vital principle.

After our Lord's resurrection his *ascension into heaven* follows. Upon this truth depends our future ascension to mansions of eternal happiness in the skies. This is the foundation of the Christian's hope, both sure and steadfast, that Jesus the forerunner has entered for us within the vail, but will come again and receive us, that where he is we may be also.

The place to which our Saviour ascended is said to be *heaven*; not the starry heaven, but the third heaven, the *heaven of heavens*, the throne of God and habitation of the Almighty. While Jesus ascended

from the midst of his gazing apostles two angels appeared and asked: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." If Jesus Christ is gone into heaven and is at the right hand of God, how can the popish doctrine of *transubstantiation* be true? It is evidently untrue. His body is not upon the earth, but in *heaven*, and will continue there until he comes to judge the world. (Acts iii, 21.)

*He there sitteth at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty, till he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.* This is another precious truth of the Apostles' Creed. St. Peter declares that Jesus Christ "is gone into heaven, and is at the right hand of God, angels, principalities, and powers being made subject unto him."

After his resurrection our Lord appeared unto his *apostles*, and in view of his ascension and exaltation to his Father's right hand, he assured them that all power would be given him, both in heaven and upon earth. "For," from that time, (John v, 22, 23,) "the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father;" that is, as their governor and judge. The Lord Jesus is now seated upon his glorious throne, where he must reign until all hostile powers are brought under his feet. (Col. i, 18.)

He is the *alpha* and the *omega*, "he that liveth, and was dead; and behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell (*hades*) and of death." Rev. i, 18. From these and similar Scriptures we learn that the affairs of *providence* as well as *grace* are all committed into the hands of our LORD JESUS CHRIST. This power and authority he constantly exercises for his own and his Father's glory and the good of his Church; and will continue so to do until the end of the world. Then *he shall come from heaven to judge both the quick and the dead.*

This is the last particular attributed in the Apostles' Creed to the SON, and refers plainly to the day of judgment at the end of the world, when he shall come to judge all mankind, both the *quick* and the *dead*. Some of the early Churches entertained this opinion: "that by quick and dead are meant the good and the bad." *Diodorus*, Bishop of Tarsus, who lived about the year 380, says, "that by the quick and dead are signified the godly and ungodly." The true meaning, however, of this article is that all mankind, both good and bad, the dead as well as the living, at that last moment shall appear before the solemn tribunal of our Lord Jesus Christ. Then shall the *beast* and the *false prophet* be taken, and cast alive



into the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death. The dominion of sin shall then be accomplished, and the *saints* take the kingdom and rule; the dead, small and great, stand up together before God. The books shall be opened, and all mankind be judged out of the things written in the books, and every one according to his works.

This will be the signal and decisive day of the LORD. The heavens shall blaze into universal conflagration; devouring fire run along their wide extended arch; the elements melt with fervent heat; this earth and all its works shall be burned up. The whole host of holy angels shall attend the coming of our Saviour; and the everlasting state of the "*quick and the dead*," all the inhabitants of our earth, shall be unalterably decided by the power and wisdom of the supreme Judge. Then shall the present heavens pass away with a great noise, every mountain and island be moved out of its place. New heavens and a new earth shall be created, wherein the righteous shall dwell in perfect happiness. Wherefore let us comfort ourselves and one another with this blissful and glorious prospect.

St. Augustine somewhere writes: "That our belief might be perfected concerning God, the Creed proceeds to add that we must also believe in the Holy Ghost." Our faith respecting GOD the *Father* and the *Son* had been already declared, now it is affirmed in the *Holy Spirit*. Article IV. of our own Church thus reads: "The Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God." Such is the emphatic language of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the doctrine in the Creed has always been a vital principle of Christianity. The very form of baptism has ever been solemnized in the *name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. The Holy Ghost being joined with the Father and the Son, we can infer the equality of the sacred Trinity. There is but one faith in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and baptism is given in the names of all the three. No one can possibly imagine that this holy rite would be perfect if given in the name of the Father and of the Son without adding the Holy Ghost. Those converts to Christianity mentioned in the nineteenth chapter of Acts, baptized with John's baptism, and who had believed in God the Father and Christ Jesus, were again baptized, because they knew not the *Holy Ghost*. They then received the true baptism, for without the Holy Ghost the mystery of the *Trinity* was imperfect. There is much more declared in the Creed relating to the Father and the Son than concerning the Holy Ghost. This manifestly arose from the fact

that there was not in the primitive Church so much controversy about the divinity and person of the Holy Ghost. The Gnostics and other heretics were most violent in their wicked attacks against the Father and the Son, and hence the Church took greatest care of the parts most exposed and assaulted.

In the fourth century the Council of Constantinople agreed that the Holy Spirit is a divine person, and proceeded from the Father, and was equal with God. But in the ninth century it was declared that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son as well as the Father, and this new doctrine was inserted in the Creed, and affirms what is generally supposed to be taught in the New Testament. This is the argument: The Son, being the second person in the Trinity by eternal generation, so the Holy Ghost is the third person by eternal procession from God the Father and God the Son, as from one divine essence.

It may easily be shown that the Holy Ghost is a real and distinct person in the Godhead. "For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." 1 Cor. ii, 10. "Baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen." 2 Cor. xiii, 14. "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, he will testify of me." These, with numerous texts of a like import, clearly prove the *personality* of the *Holy Ghost*. He is not a mere attribute of God, but a distinct person from the Father and the Son, God's messenger to convict and to sanctify the heart, and testify these truths. Then he is the successor of the Son of God in his holy mission to the Church and our world.

The same and like proof texts that establish the divinity of our Saviour establish also the divinity of the Holy Ghost. God is called the *Creator*, the *Son*, the *Redeemer*, and the *Holy Spirit*, the *Comforter*; and these three divine persons compose the *TRINITY* in one essential Godhead. To this sentiment the early Christians subscribed. *Basil*, commonly called the *Great*, who died in Cappadocia, A. D. 378 or 9, testifies: "Seeing by the same things that God the Father and the Son are characterized and described in Scripture, by the same things is the Holy Ghost characterized and described, it is hence gathered that the Spirit is of the same Deity with the Father." St. Augustine, in A. D. 410, declares: "For so the Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost God, and all together *one God*." From this *HOLY GHOST* we derive spiritual blessings, given to the world through the mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ. He regen-

erates the soul, witnesses the believer's adoption into God's family, sanctifies his inner spiritual life, and finally, washed in the all-atoning blood, will bring him to the Lamb of God in glory, forever to

"Praise FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST!"

Following our faith in the Holy Ghost, most creeds insert the article, *The holy Catholic Church*. The most ancient used only the words holy Church; *Catholic* was afterward added by the Greeks for explanation, from whom the Latins received it, and inserted in their creed as now read, *the holy Catholic Church*. At an early period the heretics and schismatics called their congregations Churches, and against their errors, as well as to preserve the *unity* of the apostolic, universal, and true Church, the term *Catholic* was inserted in the Creed. It was not confined, like others, within certain places or provinces, but, in the quaint, striking language of a very ancient writer, "enlarged by the splendor of one faith, from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof."

But what is the CHURCH? In the Episcopal Homily for Whitsunday we find this answer: "The true Church is a universal congregation of God's faithful and elect people, 'built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.' And it always hath these notes or marks whereby it is known: *pure and sound doctrine, the sacraments administered according to Christ's holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline.*" *Ox. ed.*, p. 413. Our own excellent Confession of Faith declares: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all things that of necessity are requisite to the same."

It is said that the word Church was taken from the Jews and applied to particular societies of believers, as in Acts viii, 1: "The Church at Jerusalem." In its Scripture sense it doubtless means the whole body of believers redeemed in every nation, who are called the Church of Jesus Christ. It is called "*visible*" to distinguish it from the *universal* Church; its members may be seen, their assemblies and worship are open and public, and it embraces that part of the militant, invisible Church still on the earth. On the contrary the *invisible* Church embraces the whole family of God, on earth or triumphant in heaven, from the beginning to the end of time.

The vital test and principle of the true Church of Christ is that "*the pure word of God is preached;*" and by this, and not the authority and decisions of the Church, are we to judge of her

purity and power. Romanists maintain exactly the reverse of this theory, vainly affirming that the authority of the Scriptures is derived from the Church. They declare that she has the only right to determine what is the pure word of God; and assuming this foolish absurdity, they have not only corrupted the pure word, but even maintain that of itself it is not sufficient for salvation! Therefore they boldly join the uncertain traditions of man to God's sure and unerring Scriptures. At a solemn Council of Trent, held A. D. 1416, they proceeded farther still, by placing the Apocryphal books on the same standing as the Bible. Protestant Christians claim that the Bible, without fables, tradition, or the Apocrypha, is the pure word of God, and makes this belief, with the two sacraments, the dividing line between themselves and the Papists.

In Christ's Church we recognize but two sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper; strongly resembling those of the Old Testament, circumcision and the passover, which represented Christ *as to come*. In the New the sacraments represent our Saviour as *already come*, and in both dispensations they were *signs* and *seals* of the righteousness of faith. To these sacraments of the Christian Church the Romanists have added *five* more, *confirmation*, *penance*, *extreme unction*, *ordination*, and *marriage*. With this wicked assumption they have united if possible a worse outrage, the perversion of the scriptural formula and nature of baptism with the bodily presence of Christ in the bread and wine of his last supper. Thus they pervert and annul his express words, by withholding the sacramental cup from the communicants. In the true Church we are invited to "Take, eat," and "drink ye *all* of it," and "Do this in remembrance of me." Without these essentials no Christian sacrament of the Lord's Supper can be truly and properly administered, nor any Church pure and "catholic." By baptism we are admitted into the Christian Church; and by the Lord's Supper the believer perpetually remembers the death of his Lord and Saviour, the world's Redeemer. In both sacraments the visible Church is distinguished from Pagans, Mohammedans, and Jews, Romanists and infidels. To this pure, peaceful, and holy Church, in opposition to all errors, by the grace of God, we will cleave and adhere!

The article, the *communion of saints*, in the Apostles' Creed did not originally form a part of the ante-Nicene, as was the case also with the *descent into hell*. Both of these articles have an equivocal meaning, and are liable to misapprehension, while that of the others is perspicuous and plain. It is an open question whether "the communion of saints" is a distinct, independent article of faith, or, as

some declare, an explanatory appendage to the preceding, the *holy catholic Church*. Hence, in some editions of the Book of Common Prayer it is separated from this the antecedent clause only by a comma, in others by a semicolon. Exegetically, the sense of the entire article may be thus expressed: "The holy catholic (universal) Church, which is the community of saints." Thus understood, the visible Church is declared in the Creed to be that society or body embracing the community of pious persons who substantially acknowledge the same faith, holding fellowship with one another and with Jesus Christ, their common spiritual head. If the latter clause, the *communion of saints*, be considered a distinct and separate article of the Creed, then it dogmatically or positively asserts that there exists within the visible universal Church a *spiritual* as well as an *outward* union. This, then, is the communion and fellowship of saints—a communion of kindred souls, found only among real Christians.

Of the next article, *the forgiveness of sins*, the terms are very plain and easily to be understood. "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God," and without the atonement of Christ all must be lost; so that sin is universal, and involves all men. This article inculcates the belief and truth that God, for the sake of Christ, will freely forgive all the sins of those who sincerely repent and believe in the Gospel. In the expositions of some early fathers upon this doctrine of the Creed, we read much about *baptismal regeneration*; but faith alone is the condition of a sinner's justification before God. If this is the only condition of pardon, it is certain that man cannot be justified by works; "knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ." Gal. ii, 16. More fully to enforce this doctrine, the apostle adds: "By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified."

The "*resurrection of the body*" from the very beginning of Christianity has been an article in the Apostles' Creed; the doctrine itself being a foundation stone upon which the whole system of Christianity rests. No truth of our holy religion is more important than this. If Christ did not rise from the grave the New Testament is a mere fable, and our sinful world still without hope. If HE did rise, the Scriptures are true, and men may look to HIM and be saved. But Christ "*was crucified, dead, and buried*," and did truly arise again from the dead. When the apostles first went forth to convert the world, their method was "to preach *Jesus and the resurrection*." If there should be no resurrection of the dead, this grand motive to believe the Gospel would be entirely destroyed. The apostles published this doctrine in the very place where our Saviour was

tried and crucified, and among his enemies. So powerful was the important truth among the people, that while Peter was declaring it three thousand of the Jews were converted to God, and soon after five thousand. The Jewish Council were confounded, and commanded the apostles "not to speak at all, nor teach in the name of Jesus." Infidelity cannot resist these *facts*, and these facts place Christianity on an imperishable foundation.

This doctrine, so essential to Christianity, was violently attacked by heathens and heretics in the apostles' times, and hence they also so often defended the momentous truth. When St. Paul declared it at Athens, the seat of learning and the arts, the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers "encountered" and "mocked him," "because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection." The more profane and less considerate ridiculed it, and even false Christians, as Hymeneus and Philetus, erring concerning the truth, said that the resurrection was past already, and so overthrew the faith of some.

*Life everlasting*, the last article of the Apostles' Creed, naturally follows *the resurrection of the body*. In the primitive creeds this was variously placed, as in St. Cyprian's "life everlasting *through the Church*," but the apostles properly expressed the doctrine at the conclusion. It is the end of our faith, the introduction of every man to his eternal place and state. The dead raised, the quick and dead having received their final sentence from the Supreme Judge, all men, good and bad, shall depart into their appointed place, there to remain during *life everlasting*. The godly shall live happy forever in eternal life, but the wicked miserably, without dying, in eternal death; or, in the impressive, solemn words of Scripture, "and they that have done good shall go into *life everlasting*; and they that have done evil into *everlasting fire*."

*Life everlasting!* Blessed declaration and truth! To this joyful termination of our mortal life do the doctrines of the Apostles' Creed conduct us. How beautiful the gradation! A saving belief in *God the Father Almighty—and in Jesus Christ his only Son, our Lord—was crucified, dead, and buried—He ascended into heaven—From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead—a belief in the Holy Ghost—the Holy Catholic Church—the communion of saints—the forgiveness of sins—the resurrection of the body—and the life everlasting.* Amen.



## ART. X.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

## GREAT BRITAIN.

**The Protestant Churches.**—THE MAY ANNIVERSARIES of all the great religious and philanthropic societies of England have been again attended with the usual success. No observer will deny that the interest of all Great Britain in these multitudinous forces that are ceaselessly operating for the reformation and exaltation of humanity is steadily growing. Their influence already pervades and ameliorates the world, and promises the greatest results for the future. A number of societies, as the Wesleyan Missionary Society and the British and Foreign Bible Society, reported an income considerably exceeding that of any preceding year. A novel and noticeable feature of the last months is THE MISSIONARY CONFERENCE OF LIVERPOOL, held on March 19th and following days. A large number of missionaries from all parts of the foreign field, and representing nearly all the different evangelical bodies, attended; a spirit of love and union was largely manifested throughout the proceedings, and all parted with the hope that the impetus communicated at those gatherings would be felt at the remotest missionary station. The upper house of THE CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY at its last meeting (Feb. 14) agreed, after long discussion, to an address to the queen, that she would grant her "royal license to allow the convocation of Canterbury to alter and amend the canon whereby fathers are prevented from acting as godfathers to their children." The Bishop of Lincoln adduced as an argument, that children were now often baptized by Wesleyan ministers, who require no sponsors, in consequence of the difficulty experienced in inducing persons to stand as godfathers and godmothers; and the Bishop of Oxford, who exhibits an unceasing activity in giving new life to existing ecclesiastical forms, availed himself of the opportunity to urge the question whether a body like the Church of England ought to be suffered to go on with a code of dead and obsolete canons like the present. He suggested that the bishops should combine to draw up a valuable body of canons, as "this was quite a different thing from altering the Liturgy and Articles, and did not involve any questions of doctrine." The Lower

House was chiefly engaged with recording conservative resolutions and protesting against innovations, such as the revision of the Liturgy. The movement respecting the latter question may be considered for the present to have failed, as about ten thousand clergymen have signed a declaration stating that alterations could not be made without great danger to the peace and unity of the Church. THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL SYNOD has at last decided the case of Bishop Forbes, of Brechin. The bishop was accused by a clergyman of his diocese of teaching, in a charge delivered to his clergy on the fifth of August, 1857, doctrines contrary and repugnant to the articles of religion, and certain parts of the formularies for public worship used in the Scottish Episcopal Church, in so far as he taught, (1.) That, "the Eucharist Sacrifice is the same substantially with that of the cross." (2.) That "supreme adoration is due to the body and blood of Christ mysteriously present in the gifts," and that "the worship is due not to the gifts, but to Christ in the gifts." (3.) "That in some sense the wicked do receive Christ indeed to their condemnation and loss." The case came before the synod on February 7th and the following days, when the bishop most emphatically avowed his belief in consubstantiation, and pleaded that the presenters were bound to show that the passages complained of were subversive of the literal and grammatical sense of the articles, formularies, or offices of the Church. On March 14th the synod made known its decision. The bishop was admonished, and warned to be more careful in future. THE REVIVAL MOVEMENT continues, though with less of outward excitement, in different parts of the country. It is, in particular, progressing among the fishing population of the coast of Scotland, and among the lowest population of the large towns, especially in Edinburgh and Glasgow. The special difference, if it may be so called, between the appearances in England and those in other parts of the kingdom is, that in Scotland and Ireland the revival is confined to localities and classes, while in England the work is pretty generally diffused, and prostrations, shrieks, and other tokens of excitement have hardly made their appearance.

**The Roman Catholic Church.**—THE SUBSCRIPTION FOR THE POPE has yielded more in Ireland than was generally expected. In Cork one Church responded to the appeal of the bishop by collecting one thousand pounds in hard money before the meeting broke up. Similar results are reported of other Churches in the large cities. It is considered certain that the total of the Irish contributions will not fall short of twenty thousand pounds. In London an account has been opened at the London Joint Stock Bank for the receipts of "offerings for the Pope." The committee of this fund consists of the Duke of Norfolk, Lord Petre, Lord Fielding, the Hon. Charles Langdale, Sir John Acton, etc.

#### GERMANY, PRUSSIA, AUSTRIA.

**The Protestant Churches.**—THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE AUSTRIAN GOVERNMENT AND THE HUNGARIAN PROTESTANTS is not yet at an end. The decree of January 16, that all congregations, which would not adopt the Imperial Patent until the end of March would forfeit their rights and claims as congregations, has not had the desired effect. In the Church of the Helvetic Confession (Calvinistic Church) at least, a vast majority of all the congregations still continued, in May, to refuse compliance with the demands of government. The Church of the Augsburg Confession (Lutheran Church) has not shown itself quite so inflexible, as a majority of congregations have wholly or partially accepted the new constitution. This attitude of the Lutherans is partly owing to the influence of the German Protestant press, which continues, almost unanimously, to advise the acceptance of the Patent as the most expedient course under the present circumstances. It has been observed that the Magyar element of this Hungarian population acts as the leader in the opposition to the government, while the Germans of Hungary are divided, and the Slavonians side mostly with the government. The Protestants of the German provinces generally desire a constitution similar to the one offered to the Hungarians, as they think that it would be a considerable amelioration of their present oppressed condition. It is therefore likely that they will make no opposition to a similar patent regulating their Church affairs, which has already been announced as soon forthcoming. But to whatever issue the constitutional controversy may be brought, it is a cheer-

ing certainty that Austrian Protestantism is awakening to a new life, and already in the midst of a vigorous development. It no longer stands aloof from the great movements agitating the Protestant world, but begins to take an active part in them. Voluntary associations, formerly unknown, are multiplying, and the religious press increases both in number and in influence, and Churches are established in districts where Protestantism has been entirely unknown for about two hundred years, and numerous converts are constantly received from the Roman Church. In Prussia a long expected decree concerning the ELECTION OF PRESBYTERIES OR LOCAL CHURCH COUNCILS in all the congregations of the eastern provinces which are as yet without them, was issued on Feb. 27. It is hoped that the establishment of local presbyteries will soon be followed by provisions for the convocation of diocesan and general synods. THE TERCENTENARY COMMEMORATION OF THE DEATH OF MELANCTHON was celebrated on April 17 by all the Protestant Churches of Germany with great solemnity. As "Master Philippus" (thus Luther used to call his familiar friend) frequently knew, during his lifetime, how to mediate a reconciliation or a truce between diverging parties, thus the tercentenary of his death served as an armistice for all the theological parties of modern Germany, and the representatives of all assembled around his tomb in peaceful harmony. THE HIGH CHURCH LUTHERANS have had many opportunities to sympathize with the misfortunes of their leaders. In Berlin, Professor Hengstenberg has been condemned to a fine of thirty thalers, or to fourteen days' imprisonment, as well as the payment of the bail of 2,500 thalers and the establishment of the stamp duty, for having discussed political and social questions in his "*Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*," without having paid the securities and stamp dues to which political papers are subject according to law. In this case it is, however, not only the friends and admirers of Hengstenberg who hope that his appeal to the Supreme Court may be successful, for a confirmation of the sentence would endanger the freedom of the whole ecclesiastical press of Prussia in the most serious manner. In Hesse-Cassel the High Church portion of the Lutheran clergy have tested their strength by means of an address of sympathy to their gifted leader, Professor Vilmar, of Marburg, who had been found guilty of having defamed his colleagues in the the-

ological faculty. The address has received one hundred and forty-six signatures.

**The Roman Catholic Church.**—THE BISHOPS OF PRUSSIA have followed the example of those of France in establishing the old ecclesiastical custom of holding Provincial Councils. For longer than a hundred years the Provincial Councils have been in desuetude in all Germany, although the Council of Trent ordered them to be held every third year, and the Roman Catholics, of course, regard this circumstance as a sign of the reviving strength of their Church. This first council takes place for the Ecclesiastical Province of Cologne, and will be attended by the Archbishop of Cologne, and his suffragans the Bishops of Treves, Munster, and Paderborn, besides whom also the Bishops of Breslau, Osnabruck, and Hildesheim, (the two latter from the kingdom of Hanover) will be present. As is usual at these councils, there will be present, also, deputies from the Cathedral Chapters, from the University, (of Bonn,) from the Theological Seminaries, and the provincials of all the monastic orders. The latter have considerably increased in Prussia since 1848; then only one order, the Franciscans, were tolerated, while now, besides them, the Jesuits, Redemptionists, Lazarists, Dominicans, and Capuchins will be represented. THE CONCORDAT WITH BADEN has been defeated, as was expected, in the Second Chamber of the Grandduchy with 45 against 15 votes, and immediately after the Grand Duke has dismissed those members of the ministry who were the chief advocates of the concordat, and appointed in their place the leaders of the opposition. After the example of Baden, the Second Chamber of Nassau has declared itself, with all except five votes, against the conclusion of a concordat. On the other hand, however, the friends of state churchism begin to see that the former relation of the established Churches to the state has become untenable, and that the spirit of the times demands at least freedom of the Churches in all internal affairs.

#### FRANCE.

**The Protestant Churches.**—FRESH ATTACKS UPON THE RELIGIOUS LIBERTY OF PROTESTANTS have repeatedly been made. The Minister of Public Worship has addressed a circular to the consistories of the Reformed Church, in which he decides that the Pastoral Conferences,

which have been held for several years without molestation on the part of the government, and have already been a great blessing to the Church, cannot in future meet legally without his approbation, obtained through request and under the eye of the nearest consistory. The minister declares that this measure has for its aim only the preservation of the organic constitution of the Reformed Churches. But it is especially the Dissenters who have to suffer from the illiberal provisions of the French law. The evangelical congregations in the Haute Vienne, a large portion of which consists of converts from the Roman Church, although at length allowed to meet again for divine worship, are still deprived of their schools closed in 1852. Since then devoted schoolmasters have itinerated among the peasants, teaching the children singly or in family groups, always avoiding the simultaneous teaching of two children of different families, which in the eye of the law would constitute a school. Suddenly, one of these faithful men, Jusnel, was called before the tribunal of Ballac, because children of different families had been present simultaneously at his instruction, though he was teaching them singly. The court fined him fifty francs for illicit school-keeping, and the superior court of Limoges, to which he appealed, confirmed the judgment. A MOVEMENT FOR THE RESTORATION OF THE NATIONAL SYNOD is gradually increasing in the Reformed Church. An energetic layman, M. de Coninck, of Havre, has circulated a printed letter calling attention to the importance of coming to an understanding respecting the duties of such an assembly, as on its decisions will depend the very existence of the Reformed Church. He has taken the opportunity of the annual assemblies for laying the subject before the ministers of the Churches. Either the Reformed Church of France would be reconstituted on her old basis of taking the Bible as the perfect and only authority in matters of faith; of believing in the fall of man, and his state of condemnation before God; in free redemption by the expiatory blood of Christ, true God and true man, and sole mediator between God and man; or she might fall into the hands of the fatal school of theology which admits neither doctrine nor discipline. THE STRENGTH OF THE TWO PARTIES in the Reformed Church has been recently tested at the nomination of a candidate to the vacant professorship of Montauban.

votedness to him. Of course we do not mean to deny that they have also been DEMONSTRATIONS IN FAVOR OF THE POPE. The bishops, in particular, seem without exception to side with the Pope, and in this respect there appears in fact a greater unanimity in the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church than at any previous period of her history. Many addresses of sympathy are also reported to have been received by the Pope from the lower clergy, the nobility, and all classes of the people. But nothing has as yet been published concerning the details of these addresses which would demand a rectification of our above statements respecting the numerical proportion of the papal and the antipapal party among the Italian people.

#### TURKEY.

**Mohammedanism.**—MOVEMENTS OF AN EXTRAORDINARY IMPORTANCE are going on among the Mussulmans. While hitherto the labors of the missionaries in Turkey have been chiefly confined to the Greek and Armenian portions of the population, now also the movement among the Mohammedans within the last three or four months has become the object of the greatest and most intensive interest. More than nine thousand Bibles have been sold to the Turks of Constantinople during four months, and the number of Turks who are reading the Bible is one of the marked features of the present movement. It is now sold publicly in the streets, and even in the mosque side by side with the Koran. The exact number of Bible readers cannot, of course, be definitely ascertained, but the Turks themselves say there are not less than ten thousand in this city alone who are diligently and earnestly studying the Scriptures, and there are great numbers also in other parts of the empire. In Jerusalem, according to a letter from Bishop Gobat, eighty soldiers and seven officers of the Turkish army were accustomed to meet regularly with one of the colporteurs for the purpose of reading the Bible. Some thirty or forty Mussulmans attend at Constantinople the service of the Rev. Mr. Williams every Sunday. Within three years more than twenty Mussulmans have been baptized in Constantinople. Several have been baptized recently, among them a mollah, or Mohammedan priest, and the nephew of a pasha. Unfortunately, the present

government of the Sultan is not much inclined to carry out the pledges of religious liberty which have been given to Christendom. New cases of religious persecution have occurred, and Russia has therefore proposed to the great powers which signed the treaty of Paris, to inquire into the way Turkey has fulfilled her promises concerning the rights of her Christian subjects.

#### The Greek and other Eastern Churches.

—THE NATIONAL COUNCIL of the Greek Church, which assembled in 1858 in order to take appropriate measures for a reorganization of the Church, closed its deliberations on February 4th of the present year. The most important points which the majority of the Council agreed upon were, to deprive the Patriarchs and Synods of all secular and judicial power, and especially of the right to levy taxes, to establish a secular board of administration, and to assign fixed salaries to the higher and lower clergy. The Patriarch Kyrillos and a considerable portion of the higher clergy support the reformatory measures, which are principally opposed by the seven chief bishops of the Synod of Constantinople. At the present juncture of circumstances the progressive party feels confident of a victory. The contest between the hierarchical and the progressive parties is not the only question which agitates the Church. THE SLAVONIAN AND ROUMANIAN PROVINCES (Bulgaria, Servia, Wallachia, and Moldavia) demand more urgently than ever before their entire ecclesiastical independence of Constantinople, the appointment of National Patriarchs and Metropolitans, and the convocation of National Synods. Partial concessions have been already made to them, and it is the general belief that ere long they will form three or more independent Eastern Episcopal Churches. On the other hand it is rumored that the ARMENIAN CHURCH, at the instigation of Russia, seeks a union with the Greek Church, and that the Catholics Mattheos of Etchmiadzin has already taken initiatory steps to this end. THE JACOBITES have recently lost by death their Maphrian (that is, chief bishop of the Eastern part of the Church in Turkey) Benan, at Mosul, whose sympathy with the Protestants has caused much rejoicing among the Roman Catholics at his death, as an enemy of their Church.

## ART. XI.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

## I. GERMANY.

## 1. Exegetical Literature.

Delitzsch, Franz, *Commentar über die Genesis*. 8vo., pp. 648. 3d edit. Leipsic, 1860. The second edition of this commentary appeared about seven years ago, since which time the author has without interruption made preparations for the new edition which has just been issued. Only a few pages have remained unaltered, so that the new edition may almost be regarded as an entirely new work. The introduction treats of the high significance of the Genesis; of the Thora and the post-mosaic history and literature of the Thora regarded as a book of revelation and as a whole; of the Genesis as a part of this whole and of its division; of the authenticity of the Deuteronomium; of the change of the divine names; of the history of the critical attacks on the Genesis, and of the refutations of these attacks; and finally, a survey of the history of its interpretation. Professor Delitzsch is well known as ranking among the best commentators of the Bible now living, and this revised edition of one of his best works will therefore be welcomed by all biblical scholars.

Credner, C. A., *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*. Herausgegeben von G. Volkmar. 8vo., pp. 424. Berlin, 1860. Professor Credner of Giessen, a chief representative of the rationalistic party of Germany, intended to conclude his literary activity with a comprehensive history of the canon of the New Testament, but death (July 16, 1857) prevented his finishing the work. The manuscript was complete, but it had been written at different periods of his life. It was therefore the task of the editor to compare the literature of the last years, and to bring the whole work up to the present state of theological science. The work is divided into four parts; the first treats of the formation of the canon in the ancient Church, the second of the oldest collections, the third of the final fixation of the canon in the Eastern Church, and the fourth of the final fixation of the canon in the Latin Church. The name of the editor, as well as that of the author, indicates that the book will be full of rationalistic assumptions and speculations.

Of the Commentary on Genesis, by A. Knobel, (Rationalist,) a second edition has been issued. It forms the eleventh volume of the collection of commentaries on the Old Testament, published by various scholars under the name *Kurzfassendes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament*. (Leipsic, 1860.)

"The Passage of the Israelites from Egypt to Canaan" has been made the subject of a special work by G. Unrah. (*Der Zug der Israeliten*, etc. Langensals, 1860.) A map illustrating the discussions of the text is added. C. Schulze has published a volume on Biblical Proverbs. (*Die Biblischen Sprichwörter*. Goettingen, 1860.)

Of the Introduction to the Bible by the late De Wette, (*Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die Bibel*. Berlin, 2 vols., 1860,) the sixth edition has been published. The new editions of the commentaries of the De Wette have been thoroughly revised and greatly altered by young theologians, who reject his rationalistic views. We do not know whether the same is the case with the introduction.

A new Commentary on the Revelation has been published by a Roman Catholic theologian, M. Benno. (*Die Offenbarung des heiligen Johannes Erklärt*. Munich, 1860.)

## 2. Historic Theology.

The ter-centenary anniversary of the death-day of Melancthon has called forth an exceedingly numerous Melancthon literature. We have noticed in the last numbers of the German Bibliography more than a dozen different biographies, several of which are only small tracts, while others are in book form. Among the latter are the works of Czerwenka, (Erlangen,) Shultz, (Berlin,) Heppe, (Munich,) and others.

The work of Rev. C. Strack, "Missionary History of Germany, or, How Germany became a Christian Country," (*Missionsgeschichte von Deutschland*. Leipsic, 1860,) is the first popular Protestant work on the introduction of Christianity into all Germany, and therefore fills a real desideratum. Chapter I describes the pagan

Germans; ch. ii reports on the spreading of Christianity under the dominion of the Romans; chaps. iii, iv, and v are occupied with the conversion of the Franks, the Alemanni, and the Bavarians; ch. vi is devoted to Boniface and his forerunners from England; ch. vii to Charlemagne; ch. viii to Ansgarius, the Apostle of the North; ch. ix treats of the conversion of the Slavonians in Germany, and ch. x of the conversion of the Prussians. An additional chapter discusses the question, What influence has the introduction of Christianity exercised on Germany?

A curious book, which well characterizes the relation of the European Churches to the state, has been published by Dr. Vilmar, the well-known Romanizing Lutheran, on the history of the denominational character of the Church of the Hessian states, especially of the Electorate of Hesse Kassel. (*Geschichte des confessionsstandes der evang. Kirche in Hessen-Marburg*, 1860.) The Church of Hesse-Kassel is a model of all state Churches; it does not know itself whether it is Lutheran and Reformed, and to decide this question, not the personal faith of the clergy and the congregations is consulted, but old parchments, two and three hundred years old. The controversy is carried on between the Lutheran and Reformed theologians with the utmost acrimony.

The Struggle of Luther with the Anti-Christian Principles of the Revolution (*Luthers Ringen mit den Anti-Christlichen Principien der Revolution*. Halle, 1860) is the title of a work by H. Vorrester. The subject is one which has often occupied the attention of Protestant writers of various schools, and has received from them the most diverging answers. The ideas of right, reformation, and resolution; the nature of the Apostolic Church; Christianity and Anti-Christianity in their mutual development; Humanism in general, and German Humanism in particular; the revolutionary knighthood, and, in particular, Ulric von Hutten; Luther's reformatory mission, and his deviations from the purity of this mission, and the lasting influences which the period of this deviation had on the religious and theological position of Luther in the Church, are the attractive headings of the several chapters.

### 3. Other Branches of Theology.

Ehrenfeuchter, Fr. (Professor of Goettingen) *Practical Theology* (*Practische Theo-*

*logie*) 1 vol., pp. 460. Goettingen, 1859. The author assigns to practical theology the task to represent the life of the Church, and to show that its existence is intimately connected with the highest aims of man, and that therefore every deviation from the Church is an injury of our best interests. This first volume is divided into two parts. The first part treats of the essence, the appearance and present condition of the Church, of the ministry, and of practical theology as a system. The second book is devoted to the missionary efforts of the Church, and speaks of the pagan world, or the object of the mission; of Christianity, or the principle of the mission; and of the historical law, which is observable in the epochs of the mission. To this is added a chapter on the doctrine of the mission, on missionary preaching, and on the relation of the mission to the Church.

The question of divorce, which is at present agitated in nearly all the Protestant Churches of Europe, has been again treated of in a small work of E. Huschke, Professor of Law at the University of Breslau. (*Was lehrt Gottes Wort von der Ehescheidung*. Leipzig, 1860.) The author is one of the leaders of the Separated Lutherans of Germany, who chose rather to secede from the established Church than to give up any of the doctrinal or ecclesiastical landmarks of their theology. In this question the strict Lutherans have maintained a very honorable contest against the laxity of the Prussian legislation in behalf of what they consider, in common with most evangelical denominations, the true Scriptural doctrine on divorce.

### II. FRANCE.

Saint René Taillandier, *Histoire et Philosophie Religieuse*. Paris, 1860.

Mr. Taillandier, Professor in Montpellier, has collected in this volume the frequent contributions which for years he has furnished to the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. Though mostly devoted to purely literary questions, his contributions have awakened a great interest also in religious circles, as the author is of a deeply religious turn of mind, and belongs to that school of French scholars who desire and seek to promote the union between faith and science, between Christianity and philosophy. As the number of French Protestants is so small, and their own literary publications cannot, therefore, be numerous, it is a good sign of the times



that so many leading scholars of France proclaim the necessity of a return of the science to faith, and acknowledge at the same time the great merits of Protestantism, and the superiority of the Protestant civilization.

Le R. P. Felix, S. J. *Le Progrès par le Christianisme. Conférences de Notre Dame de Paris.* 4 vols. Paris, 1859.

This volume contains the Lent Sermons, held in the Church of Notre Dame of Paris, in 1856, 1857, 1858, and 1859 by Father Felix, who is generally regarded as the best pulpit orator of the Roman Church in France now living. His extraordinary oratorical gifts are attested by the Parisian press of all shades of opinion. The last number of the *Revue Chrétienne* makes the following remarks on the Lent Sermons preached by him in the same church this year: "Father Felix, whose conferences are always attended by an immense crowd, treated this year of the family. We shall not repeat what we have said before of his oratorical gifts, of the clearness of his plans, of the lucidity of his conclusions, and of the charm of his delivery. Father Felix has shown himself very strong when stigmatizing the open or secret vices of modern society, but has been less so when pointing out the remedy that can save it. When he rolls up before us the ideal picture of the Catholic world, when he desires to make us admire those times of profound faith when marriage was respected, and disorder appeared but rarely like a monster which chilled the heart, he might have seen a smile steal upon the mouths of many of his hearers, who sought in vain in their historic reminiscences that golden age to which he alluded. Instinctively the hearers of every Catholic sermon now-a-days distinguish two different parts. As long as the orator castigates the evil, they feel that he is right, and his appeals will bear fruit; but when the man of the Church endeavors to bring back his generation to the papal theocracy, modern intelligence recoils and acts on the defens-

ive. We are certain that Father Felix must have observed himself these different impressions succeeding each other in his hearers."

Among the recent Protestant publications the *Revue Chrétienne* mentions the following:

Reuss, (Professor at the Theological Faculty of Strasbourg,) *Histoire de la Théologie Chrétienne au siècle apostolique.*

Schwalb, *Étude comparative des Doctrines de Mélancthon, Zwingli et Calvin.*

La Papauté en présence de l'Evangile et de l'histoire.

E. Casalis (formerly missionary in South Africa, now director of the missionary seminary in Paris) *Les Bassoutos, ou vingt-trois ans d'expériences et d'observations au sud de l'Afrique.*

Among the announcements of Roman Catholic literature we find a complete edition, in 14 vols., of the works of one of the favorite modern saints of the Roman Church, Francis of Sales, Bishop of Geneva. (*Œuvres complètes de St. François de Sales.*)

Cretineau Joly, J. (the ultramontane author of a comprehensive history of the Jesuits) *l'Eglise Romaine en face de la Revolution.*

Bautain, L. *Philosophie des lois au point de vue Chrétien.* The author is favorably known to Protestants no less than to his coreligionists as a man of profound learning, evangelical views, and deep piety. A work of his on eloquence was published last year in an English translation in New York.

Ponlevoy, le P. A. *Vie du R. P. Xavier de Ravignan.*

Lacordaire, le R. P. *Sainte Marie-Madeleine.*

Nicholas, Auguste. *La Vierge Marie.* The work is now complete in four volumes. The author, one of the most active ultramontanes in France, is a high officer of the government. His son became, at the beginning of the present year, a Dominican friar.

## ART. XII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES.

I.—*American Quarterly Reviews.*

- I. THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW, April, 1860.—1. The Ecclesiastical Miracles: 2. Moral Philosophy: 3. Baden Powell on the Immutability of Physical Laws: 4. Dr. Edward Beecher's "Conflict" and "Concord:" 5. The Doctrine of Romans i, 18-23: 6. The Defense of Socrates: 7. Modern Skepticism and its Refutation.
- II. THE NEW ENGLANDER, May, 1860.—1. Humboldt, Ritter, and the New Geography: 2. The Power of Contrary Choice: 3. Discourse commemorative of Rev. C. A. Goodrich, D. D.: 4. Hebrew Servitude: 5. Are the Phenomena of Spiritualism Supernatural? 6. Worcester's Dictionary: 7. Common Schools and the English Language: 8. The Marble Faun: 9. The Crime against the Right of Suffrage.
- III. BROWNSON'S QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1860.—1. Limits of Religious Thought: 2. Etudes de Theologie: 3. Ventura on Christian Politics. 4. Burnett's Path to the Church: 5. American College at Rome.
- IV. THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1860.—1. Who is Responsible for the Present Slavery Agitation: 2. Pythagoras: 3. The American State and Christianity: 4. The Anphililation of the Wicked. 5. The Insurrection of the Paxton Boys.
- V. THE THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL, April, 1860.—1. Dr. Fairbairn's Typology: 2. God is Love: 3. Dr. J. F. Berg's False View of the Second Advent: 4. Divine Authority of the Bible, in Review of Rev. A. Barnes: 5. Designation and Exposition of Isaiah, chapters xlix, l, and li.
- VI. THE AMERICAN QUARTERLY CHURCH REVIEW, April, 1860.—1. Philosophy and the Knowledge of God: 2. New Gospel in New England and the Church: 3. Bishop Griswold on the Apostolic Office: 4. The Moravians: 5. English Reformation: The Nag's Head Story: 6. Free Churches.
- VII. THE THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL, January, 1860.—1. Dr. Mansel's Limits of Religious Thought: 2. Notes on Scripture, Matthew xxiii, xxiv: 3. Christ's Promises, in the Epistles to the Churches, to those who are Victorious: 4. The Indo-Syrian Church: 5. Designation and Exposition of Isaiah, chapters xlix, l, and li: 6. The Book of Judges: 7. Mr. Hequembourg's Plan of Creation.
- VIII. THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW, April, 1860.—1. Theories of the Eldership: 2. The Dissolution of Empires: 3. Sir W. Hamilton's Theory of Perception: 4. Man, Moral and Physical: 5. The First and Second Adam.
- IX. THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1860.—1. Foreign Missions: 2. Letters on Psalmody: 3. The First Adam and the Second: 4. Verity of the Old Testament History: 5. Secondary Uses of the Ceremonial Law: 6. Systematic Beneficence.
- X. THE EVANGELICAL REVIEW, April, 1860.—1. The Study of the Scriptures: 2. For the Gifts and Calling of God are without Repentance: 3. Language: 4. Baccalaureate Address: 5. Imagination: 6. Christian Instruction in our Colleges: 7. The Field and Harvest of Ministerial Labor: 7. The Lutheran Church in Russia: 9. The Divinity of Christ: 10. Reminiscences of Lutheran Clergymen: 11. Dorpater Zeitschrift.

XI. THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW, April, 1860.—1. Constantine the Great: 2. The Old Doctrine of Christian Baptism: 3. The English Language: 4. German Hymnology: 5. Religion and Christianity: 6. What is a Catechumen? 7. Mansel's Limits of Religious Thought.

XII. THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, April, 1860.—1. A Few More Words on the Revised Book of Discipline: 2. The Relation of Organic Science to Sociology: 3. The Supernatural in the Scriptures: 4. Presbyterian Preaching at the South: 5. The Divine Right of Presbyterian Church Government; a Review of Killen's Ancient Church: 6. Baird's Elohim Revealed.

XIII. BIBLIOTHECA SACRA AND BIBLICAL REPOSITORY, April, 1860.—1. Rothe's Ethics: 2. Comparative Phonology; or, the Phonetic System of the Indo-European Languages: 3. Exegesis of 1 Corinthians xv, 35-44, as Illustrated by Natural History and Chemistry: 4. John George Hamann: 5. Romanism and a Free Bible: 6. Dr. Nathaniel W. Taylor on Moral Government in the Abstract.

XIV. AMERICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, May, 1860.—1. New England Theology historically considered: 2. Hickok's Rational Cosmology: 3. Unitarian Tendencies: 4. The Jewish Christian's Notion of a Redeemer: 5. The Alleged Progress in Theology: 6. Denominationalism not Sectarian: 7. Darwin on the Origin of Species: 8. Maine De Biran's Philosophy.

The American Theological Review has been called into existence by the necessities of the elder Calvinism. So rapid and general have been the advances of the more Arminian modifications of that system, and so uniformly have the higher periodicals of that section of the Church in these latitudes marched with those advances, that the more venerable and consistent form has been left, we believe, without a champion. Such a champion, able and scholarly, the present number, under the editorship of Professor H. B. Smith, shows itself; and we doubt not the work will live to do manful battle, not only for its own theological individualisms, but for the general Church of Christ.

The first article, by Professor E. A. Lawrence, of the East Windsor Theological Seminary, purposes to state the true limits and history of New England Calvinism. It is from an able and eloquent pen, which manages its facts with no ordinary skill. Professor Park dates the existence of New England theology from the commencement of Edwards's career. The present Review claims to remove this modern landmark backward, and include within the limits of New England theology the prevalent doctrines of the Congregational Churches generally from near the commencement of their existence. And in its derivative character, as drawn from the apostles, it "takes John Calvin into its genealogical line." The installation of this theology as adjectively "New England," took place in the adoption of the "Westminster Confession of Faith in 1648," which is now "the accredited exponent of New England theology."

Should any uncircumcised Arminian like ourself attempt an interference in this high debate, he may learn what sort of a setback he will receive from the following passage. The writer is contrasting the *believing* theologian with the *speculative*: "The derivative character of the one leads along the line of an illustrious descent to its origin with the apostles and their Lord. The lineal branches of the other came to an end some centuries this side of the

apostolic age, in Sabellius or Socinus, Arius or Arminius, whose substantive doctrine, so far as not derived from Scripture, was original, and because original, erroneous. A desire to be the originator of essentially new Christian doctrines has ever been a leading cause of corruption in theology. It is the great practical error, the original sin by which the race fell. Hence the propagators of such original theology must be reputed as in regular succession from that distinguished preacher whose first converts were made in Eden."

---

## II.—English Reviews.

- I. THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, April, 1860.—1. Vedic Religion; 2. Manin, and Venice in 1848–9; 3. The Ethics of War; 4. Plutarch and his Times. 5. Austria and the Government of Hungary; 6. Parliamentary Reform: the Dangers and the Safeguards; 7. Japan; 8. Darwin on the Origin of Species.
- II. THE LONDON REVIEW, (WESLEYAN,) April, 1860.—1. Lord Macaulay; 2. Whitby; 3. Ancient Syriac Gospels; 4. Eastern Problems; 5. Frederick Schiller; 6. Morocco; 7. Books and their Bindings; 8. Socrates; 9. Arctic Explorations.
- III. THE BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1860.—1. Lord Macaulay; 2. McLeod's Eastern Africa; 3. Christian Revivals; 4. Belgium and China; 5. Darwin on the Origin of Species; 6. Lord Dundonald; 7. Brown's Sermons; 8. China and Japan; 9. Italian Nationality.
- IV. THE NATIONAL REVIEW, April, 1860.—1. Plutarch's Lives: Clough; 2. The Testimony of Geology to the Age of the Human Race; 3. The Budget and the Treaty in their relation to Political Morality; 4. St. Thomas of Canterbury and his Biographers; 5. Madam Récamier; 6. The Acts of the Apostles; how far Historical? 7. The Reform Bill: its real Bearing and Ultimate Results; 8. Christianity in Japan; 9. Papal Rome; 10. Cerebral Psychology: Bain; 11. Mr. Bright, painted by Himself.
- V. THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, April, 1860.—1. Recent Syriac Literature; 2. A Nation's Right to Worship God; 3. Dr. Tyler and his Theology; 4. On the Power of Contrary Choice; 5. The Minister's Wooing; 6. What is Christianity? 7. The Text of Jeremiah; 8. Natural Science and Theology; 9. Principal Tulloch's Leaders of the Reformation.
- VI. THE CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER, April, 1860.—2. Lord Bacon and the Inductive Philosophy; 2. Neale's Commentary on the Psalms; 3. Mr. Mansel and Mr. Maurice; 4. Daniel Wilson; 5. Irish Revivalism in Relation to the Church of England; 6. On the Remains of Old Babylonian Literature; 7. The Bishop of Oxford's Ordination Addresses; 8. The Trial of the Bishop of Brechin; 9. Liturgical Quotations in the Pauline Epistles.
- VII. THE JOURNAL OF SACRED LITERATURE AND BIBLICAL RECORD, April, 1860.—1. Sinai, Kadesh, and Mount Hor; or, a Critical Inquiry into the Route of the Exodus; 2. Nimrod and his Dynasty; 3. George Buchanan; 4. The Sisters of Galilee and Bethany; 5. Pauline Authorship of the Hebrews; 6. Remarks on the Book of Esther; 7. Analysis of the Emblems of St. John, Rev. xiii.

VIII. THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW, May, 1860.—1. Redding's Reminiscences—Thomas Campbell: 2. Quakerism—Past and Present: 3. Sir Henry Lawrence: 4. Australian Ethnology: 5. Heine's Poems: 6. Church and State—The Spiritual and the Civil Courts: 7. Origin of Species: 8. The British Lighthouse system: 9. State of Europe.

IX. THE EDINBURGH REVIEW, OR CRITICAL JOURNAL, April, 1860.—1. Commercial Relations of England and France: 2. Youth of Milton: 3. Expense of Public Education in England: 4. English Local Nomenclature: 5. Civil Correspondence of the Duke of Wellington: 6. De Broglie's Church and Roman Empire: 7. The Alleged Shakspeare Forgeries: 8. Darwin on the Origin of Species: 9. France, Savoy, and Switzerland.

X. THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, April, 1860.—1. William Beckford: 2. Money and Credit: 3. Anne Whitney's Poems: 4. The Letters and Times of Basil of Cæsarea: 5. Nichol's Hours with the Evangelists: 6. The Law of Divorce: 7. United States Coast Survey: 8. The Life of John Collins Warren: 9. Darwin on the Origin of Species: 10. Recent French Literature: 11. Isaac Disraeli: 12. Woman's Rights as to Labor and Property.

### III.—French Reviews.

I. REVUE DES DEUX MONDES, February 15, 1860.—1. Les Commentaires d'un Soldat—III.—Les Derniers Jours de la Guerre de Crimée; 2. Le Roman de Femme en Angleterre.—Miss Mulock; 3. Les Terres Noires de la Russie, Souvenirs et Scènes de la Vie Rurale et Serve en Ukraine; 4. Rivalité de Charles—Quint et de Francois I.—Le Connétable de Bourbon.—I.—Sa Conjuración avec Charles—Quint et Henri VIII. Contre la France; 5. Etudes Morales—Le Travail et le Salaire des Femmes—Les Femmes dans la Fabrique Lyonnaise; 6. Le Programme de la Paix; 7. Episode d'un Voyage d'Agrément, Récit de la Vie Anglo-Hindoue.

March 15, 1860.—1. La Jeunesse de Mazarin; 2. L'Homme au Bracelet D'or; 3. La Cavalerie Régulière en Campagne, Souvenirs D'Afrique et de Crimée; 4. Rivalité de Charles—Quint et de Francois I.—Le Connétable de Bourbon—III.—Le Siège de Marseille et la Bataille de Pavie; 5. Un Voyage dans la Nouvelle-Grenade, Paysages de la Nature Tropicale.—III.—Rio-Hacha, les Indiens Goajires et la Sierra-Negra; 6. La Jeunesse de Phidias; 7. Les Statistiques Agricoles de la France; 8. Chronique de la Quinzaine, Histoire Politique et Littéraire.

April 1, 1860.—1. La Ville Noire; 2. Décadence Morale du XVII Siècle.—La Brinvilliers; 3. Souvenirs d'un Amiral—La Marine de la Restauration—Les Dernières Années et le Testament d'un Marin; 4. Léonard de Vinci, d'Après de Nouveaux Documens; 5. Une Nouvelle Théorie d'Histoire Naturelle—L'Origine des Espèces; 6. Du Crédit des Chemins de fer at des Moyens d'Achever Le Résau; 7. Les Armes au Feu au xixth Siècle—I.—La Poudre et les Armes Portatives; 8. Le Roman Contemporain—Corruption du Roman de Moeurs.

May 1, 1860.—1. La Ville Noire; 2. Un Voyage dans la Nouvelle-Grenade, Paysages de la Nature Tropicale.—IV.—Les Aruques et la Sierra-Nevada; 3. Une Reforme Administrative en Afrique.—III.—Des Devoirs Nouveaux du Gouvernement Colonial en Algérie; 4. Le Monde Alpestre et les Hautes Régions du Globe d'Après les Dernières Recherches de la Physique; 5. Guerre de l'Inde.—Episodes Militaires de la vie Anglo-Indienne.—

III.—Fin de la Guerre, Reprise de Lucknow, la Chasse aux Rebelles.  
6. La Comédie Anglaise sous la Restauration.—I.—Le Public; 7. De la Renaissance des Lettres Chez les Grecs Modernes.—Les Poètes Zalogostas et Orphanidis.

May 15, 1860.—1. Economistes Contemporains.—Richard Cobden et l'Ecole de Manchester, Histoire de la Liberté Commerciale en Angleterre; 2. La Reine du Sabbat, Scènes de la vie des Landes; 3. De la Situation de la France et de la Papauté en Italie; 4. La Comédie Anglaise sous la Restauration.—II.—Les Poètes; 5. La Turquie, son Gouvernement et ses Armées Pendant La Guerre D'Orient.—I.—La Campagne de Arménie; 6. Les Révolutions et les Dictatures de L'Amérique du Sud En, 1859; 7. La Saison Dramatique.—Décadence du Théâtre.

II. REVUE CHRETIENNE, March 15, 1860.—1. La Doctrine Definitive Maine de Biran; 2. Madame Récamier; 3. Les Catacombs de Rome; 4. La Lutte Religieuse in France au Seizième Siècle, à l'Occasion du livre de M. Dargaud.

May 15, 1860.—1. La Question Religieuse in Hollande; 2. Les Cours a la Sorbonne et au College de France; 3. Julian L'Apostat; 4. Bulletin Bibliographique.

#### ART. XIII.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

It is of greatest concernment in the Church and Commonwealth to have a vigilant eye how books demean themselves as well as men, and thereafter to confine, imprison, and do sharpest justice on them as malefactors; for books are not absolutely dead things, but do contain a potency of life in them to be as active as that soul was whose progeny they are.—MILTON.

##### I.—Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

- (1.) "*Christ our Life*. The Scriptural Argument for Immortality through Christ alone. By C. F. HUDSON, Author of *Debt and Grace*, as related to the Doctrine of a Future Life." 12mo., pp. 160. Boston: J. P. Jewett & Co. 1860.

The present work of Mr. Hudson's embraces a more explicit statement of his system, a completer Scripture exegesis, and a reply by the way to most of his opponents. It exhibits the same constructive skill, sharp dialectics, copious learning, keen criticism, and general good temper as his former work. His views will probably be accepted by not a few individuals who desire a half-way house between the stern eschatology of Protestant orthodoxy, and the utter effeminaey of Universalism.

Mr. Hudson regards man's soul as not necessarily but conditionally immortal. Immortality is its intentional but forfeitable destiny. Yet he evades materialism by asserting the independent existence of soul, its separate intermediate state, and its final reunion with the body at the resurrection. He eludes the charge of destroying the graduation of future penalty to the degrees of individual guilt by affirming that there are different degrees of misery and protraction in the pangs of the second death, through which the nonentity of soul and body is attained in the destiny of the wicked. Viewed, indeed, in a naturalistic light, Mr. Hudson's doctrine of conditional



immortality bears a curious analogy to Darwin's theory of the sole survivorship of individual species by adjustment to the conditions of existence. We will note a few suggestions.

1. Mr. Hudson's theory is constructed by effecting a systematic change in the definition of a number of words in Scripture and established theology. The ideas which, with singular unanimity, the piety and erudition of the Church through ages have found in Scripture terminology, and realized thereby a concord of systematic meaning in the whole, are abolished and replaced by a set of new ideas. By the same method Theism might be systematically eradicated from the Bible, and Pantheism, or absolute materialistic Atheism, be substituted instead. 2. Adopting in the terms significative of *duration* the Universalist modes of argument, Mr. H. incurs, we think, the ultimate consequence of abolishing absolute eternity from the Bible. Not for penalty alone can *αἰώνιος* and *ἀίδιος*, and their equivalent phrases, be made to designate the temporary. From our Bibles we shall be obliged to fall back upon our metaphysics for the immortality of the blessed, the stability of heaven, and the eternity of God. By such exegesis the whole system of existence, natural, supernatural, and divine, is air-hung and periodic. The most expressive dialect ever spoken by man, wielded by inspiration, has failed in the New Testament to give us an unequivocal charter of immortality. 3. Mr. Hudson's theory would give us a theology that shall sit more easily upon our sensibilities. But it is a doubtful gift. Upon its acceptance a vast solemnity goes out from our existence. A free and easy laxity, quite taking to the lazy and the licentious, pervades the air. Awful doom for sin is no more, and sin itself is no more so awful a thing. The diminished sinfulness of sin can dispense with an atonement, quite discards a Divine Mediator, and finds the Trinity decidedly useless. Mr. Hudson himself finds and exemplifies these consequences. His own theology is disorganized. His theory is a stupendous step in the direction of no religion at all.

- 
- (2.) "*A General View of the Rise, Progress, and Corruptions of Christianity.* By the Most Rev. RICHARD WHATELY, Archbishop of Dublin. With a Sketch of the Life of the Author, and a Catalogue of his Writings." 12mo., pp. 288. New York: William Gowans. 1860.

This is a republication of one of the six celebrated "Essays appended to the *Encyclopedia Britannica*," in the writing of which such men as Mackintosh and Dugald Stewart were engaged. The present work contains a biographical sketch of Whately and a list of his publications.

Preparatory to the immediate analysis of the corruptions of Christianity, Whately traces the nature and the steps of the first gradual apostacy from the primitive worship of the true God in the earliest ages of mankind. This furnishes him with some striking types of the apostacy of the Christian ages, as well as some tests for discriminating the corrupt from the pure. Next he traces the peculiar characteristics of the Jewish dispensation, and ascertains what points exclusively belonged to Judaism as an inferior and preparatory dispensation, and what were to be permanent when the time of reformation should come.

Eliminating from the developing Church the errors exhibited in the Pagan apostasy and the idiosyncracies of Judaism, and taking the positive teachings of the New Testament, we have left us a pure Christianity. The result bears with terrible effect upon the peculiarities of Romanism. The real nature of those boasted "marks of a true Church," spirituality, universality, and unity, appears transparently evident. High-churchism, image and saint worship, Mariolatry, take their ready and settled classification among the corruptions of Christianity.

We cannot quite consent to place Whately in our scanty list of great thinkers and writers. His reputation we have ever considered as quite equal to his value. Yet he is independent and suggestive, and in spite of the plainness of his style and his want of imagination and glow, his writings afford very easy and generally instructive reading. The present is among his best works, and deserves a wide circulation.

(3.) *Sermons by Rev. William Morley Punshon.* To which is prefixed a Plea for Class-Meetings, and an Introduction by Rev. WILLIAM H. MILBURN. 12mo., pp. 350. New York: Derby & Jackson. 1860.

There is no wondering at the power, nor any dubious searching for its source, in perusing these sermons. Their beauty, force, life, are visible upon the surface of the page, and palpable in any first paragraph you read. Nor are they merely esthetically excellent. There is the rich evangelic unction, which, while permitting them to stand as grand pulpit orations, secures that they shall reach the recesses of the heart and stir its deepest spiritual emotions. Few original volumes from the press of our day have furnished more admirable specimens of pulpit eloquence.

Mr. Milburn's Introduction furnishes his first impressions of Punshon's preaching, a critique upon his style, and a biography of the preacher from some unmentioned source.

Mr. Punshon was born in 1824, in Doncaster, of a well connected family. He was early placed in a mercantile clerkship; but newspaper politics and parliamentary oratory filled his head. Religious impressions snatched him from a probable political career; and he commenced preaching at eighteen, producing a memorable effect with his first sermon. Describing his pulpit style, Mr. Milburn says:

"Before he has reached his major 'thirdly,' it is all over with your independent consciousness; you have yielded at discretion, and are the prisoner of his feeling. I am half inclined to believe that his own intellect is in the same plight, and that memory acts as the warder of the brain, under writ from the lordly soul. You have thrown criticism to the dogs; your ear has exchanged itself for an eye; the bone and flesh of your forehead become delicately thin, as the laminae of the cornea, and your brain seems endowed with the power of the iris. You enjoy the ecstasy of vision, and as the speaker stops you recover yourself enough to feel that you have had an apocalyptic hour."—Page xii.

"He prepares himself for the rostrum and pulpit with the most scrupulous and exhaustive care. I should say that the greater part of his sermons and lectures are committed to memory, and delivered almost word for word, as they were beforehand composed. His recollection is, therefore, at once quick and tenacious. This plan, while it insures a higher average of public performance, and saves him from many mortifying failures, at the same time shuts him out from the ground of highest power."—Page xiii.

- (4.) "*Science in Theology*. Sermons preached in St. Mary's, Oxford, before the University. By ADAM FARRAR, A. M., F. G. S., F. R. A. S., Fellow of Queen's College, and Preacher at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall." 12mo., pp. 250. Philadelphia: Smith & English; New York: Sheldon & Co.; Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860.

The purpose of Mr. Farrar's sermons (which the title but ambiguously indicates) is to show, in some degree, the bearings which modern science possesses upon theology. He justly considers the theology of different ages to be in some degree modified and shaped by existing modes of scientific thought; and, when the scientific modification disappears, great danger arises from the identification of theology with the exploded scientific error. The ever varying relations of the two, arising from the mutabilities of science, are ever requiring new adjustments, and warning us that, even in the adjustments, the distinctive line between the two is to be carefully maintained.

Mr. Farrar proposes in his book to furnish a contribution toward adjusting present science to permanent theology. A firm Churchman, he blends an evangelical orthodoxy, both of doctrine and feeling, with a chastened liberality. He surrenders no principle authorized by the settled interpretations of the word of God, or dear to the heart of the great body of the earnest Christian Church.

His first lecture traces the gradual discovery of the Divine attributes through Scripture and science. Of the attributes of God he considers that science furnishes, in a true sense, an additional revelation, consistent with, confirming and filling out, the revelations of Scripture. Modern astronomy opens a vaster view of God's omnipresence. Geology unfolds his eternity in the past. Mathematics has prophetic demonstrations for the future. And while thus physical science illustrates the infinity of God, psychology, unfolding the instincts of conscience and the laws of right, furnishes revelation of his holiness. There is much value in this lecture.

His further topics are Divine Providence in General Laws, Divine Benevolence in the Economy of Pain, Jewish Interpretation of Prophecy, The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, The Atonement, Laws in Life Spiritual, The Gifts of the Holy Ghost, Providence in Political Revolutions. In illustration of the Trinity, he adopts Professor Mansel's method of admitting the contradiction as arising from human incompetence, which he justly considers as essentially the same as Archbishop King's explanation of the Divine attributes, by analogy: of which, by the way, a brief but excellent statement and refutation may be found in Watson's Institutes. Professor Farrar's book abounds in suggestive passages.

- 
- (5.) "*A Commentary on the Gospels of Matthew and Mark*. Intended for Popular Use. By D. D. WHEDON, D. D." 8vo., pp. 422. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1860.

To write a commentary upon the Scripture text might appear to a novice a matter of small labor and brief time. And so it is, where the work is mainly performed with scissors and maulage. But where a commentator compares, weighs, and thinks for himself, and runs the whole matter through the filter of his own mind, with a proper solicitude for the public result, he undertakes

a task of anxious years. The present volume is the product of spare hours over and above the performance of duties sufficient alone for the feeble strength of the laborer; and nothing but the sense that the responsibility had been assumed, and that no nobler labor can be performed than the bringing the word of God in contact with the popular mind, could have induced him to prosecute the work. Thus far, by a gracious Providence, it is completed; and the author is encouraged by the opinions of friends to hope that the public will be better satisfied with it than himself. If it meet the wants of the Church, he will be profoundly thankful to Almighty God that the vitality irrecoverably expended has been invested in so noble a department.

To the urgent request of Dr. Stevens it is owing that the writer first committed himself to the undertaking. To the kindness of Dr. True, of Middletown, he is indebted for a considerable amount of revision and suggestion. And he hereby passes a unanimous vote of thanks to the critical eye of Mr. Wickens, which has aided him in the adjustment of countless minutiae; to the good taste of Mr. Goodenough; together with the liberality of the Agents of the Book Concern for the new type, the fresh white paper, and the outlay in illustration which has made it one of the costliest books for the price issued from our Rooms. No manual commentary of the day has gone from the American press in a neater style.

- 
- (6.) "*Christian Perfection as taught in the Bible. An Essay containing the substance of Fletcher's Last Check to Antinomianism. With Additions and Appendixes. By the Rev. SAMUEL D. AKIN, A. M.*" 12mo., pp. 304. Nashville, Tenn.: J. B. McFerrin. 1860.

How far it is justly permissible to carve and remodel an author's work, has been often doubted; but our utilitarian age seems deciding that a profitable result justifies the process. In the present volume everything appears well done to adapt to the present age a most important part of our religious literature. The local allusions are removed, the exuberant style is chastened, and some objectionable views are omitted. The standard editions still remain to inform us which are Fletcher's words and which his reviser's. The volume may therefore be safely recommended as an excellent treatise on this important subject.

- 
- (7.) "*Illustrations of Scripture. Suggested by a Tour through the Holy Land. By HORATIO B. HACKETT, D. D., Professor of Biblical Literature in Newton Theological Institution. New and Revised Edition* Boston: Gould & Lincoln; New York: Sheldon & Co.; Cincinnati: G. S. Blanchard. 1860.

Professor Hackett surveyed the scenes of the Holy Land with the eye of a true Biblical scholar, who knows what to look for and where to look for it. His work is written in a style which interests the popular reader, and furnishes, as we have had reason to know, valuable matter for the commentator. As the result in part of a second tour through the sacred localities, the work is now rendered still more complete, and more acceptable to the Biblical scholar and popular reader.

- (8.) "*The New Discussion of the Trinity*; containing Notices of Professor Huntington's Recent Defense of that Doctrine. Reprinted from the 'Christian Examiner,' 'The Monthly Religious Magazine,' 'The Monthly Journal of the Unitarian Association,' and 'The Christian Register.' Together with Sermons, by Rev. THOMAS STARR KING and Dr. ORVILLE DEWEY." Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co. For the American Unitarian Association. 1860.

The departure of Professor Huntington has, for a brief period, as this little volume shows, ruffled the usually placid surface of Unitarian Theology. It brought out the leading organs and the star preachers to a revisal yet a new resumption of their old positions. The discussion is sharp, eloquent, and scholarly. The professor is not miserably hacked as with a butcher's cleaver, but cut up with so keen a razor's edge, that the entire slicing and dissection are, it may be, as painless as they are thorough. The desertion of the professor leaves but a single vacancy; the rank closes up, and the phalanx is as compact as ever.

The "later Unitarians," it would seem, object not so much to the Trinity, or to the Divinity of Christ, as to the "tripersonality." A man who, like Whately, wishes that the word *person* had never been adopted, and holds that the Father, Son, and Spirit imply a valid distinction of three "somewhats" in the Divine nature, though we have never heard that he was read out of the Trinitarian ranks, is, it seems, recognized as sound among the "later Unitarians."

- (9.) "*Lectures on the Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians*. By JOHN LILLIE, D. D." 12mo., pp. 515. New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1860.

This is a very scholarly work, the product of a mind well furnished with all the appliances for fundamental investigation. The author has at ready command the whole apparatus of criticism, which he exhibits purely for purpose, and not for display. The translations of both epistles are excellent, so modernizing the texture of the style as to render it the graceful English of the present day, yet strictly preserving the antique spirit that truly belongs to the Scripture style. The commentary possesses something of the disadvantage of popular exposition. We have rhetoric sometimes when we want sharp analysis or rigid logic. The frank and manly Calvinism we like to meet in its proper place. In the present case it is free and outspoken, yet deals in the sort of conventional demonstration habitual with men who have little examined the opposite side, and feel quite sure of their audience.

- (10.) "*The Year of Grace*. A History of the Revival in Ireland, A. D., 1859. By the Rev. WILLIAM GILSON, Professor of Christian Ethics in Queen's College, Belfast, and Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. With an Introduction by Rev. BARON STOWE, D. D." 12mo., pp. 464. Boston: Gould & Lincoln; New York: Sheldon & Co.; Cincinnati: G. S. Blanchard. 1860.

The late arrival of this volume has precluded a full examination, but its contents and pages seem to promise a narrative of extraordinary interest. The author was requested by the American publishers to prepare the work. He was eminently qualified, and has expended abundant labor in obtaining complete details of the facts.

- (11.) "*Disquisitions and Notes on the Gospels.* By JOHN H. MORRISON." 12mo., pp. 538. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co. 1860.

Dr. Morrison's volume fills out its title no farther than Matthew alone. As nearly all the difficulties of Mark and Luke are really considered in the present volume, the remainder of the four gospels will be concluded in a second volume, in which John will occupy the main attention. On the other New Testament books a volume is in course of preparation by Dr. A. P. Peabody. Thus there will be a New Testament complete in three volumes.

We have seldom read over a commentary with more pleasure. Our pleasure arose from a special as well as from general reasons. The fact lately brought before us that Hase's "Life of Jesus" is to be "a book for Bible classes and higher classes in Sunday schools," seemed a most disheartening omen. If the lambs of the Unitarian fold are to be fed on such aliment, and by shepherds disposed to such a selection, what awaits their next generation? Very different is the character of the present volume. In a clear simplicity, in a reverent spirit, in a believing but not uncritical tone, it is calculated to strengthen the faith and cherish the piety of its readers. A large share of the work is in the form of free and somewhat extended dissertation. The gospel narrative is told at length, by sections, in the author's own words. Critical and exegetical points are specified and discussed in the notes with learning, ability, and a mastery of the latest contributions. The opinions expressed, in the general, approach very near to the boundary lines of an orthodoxy not Calvinistic.

- 
- (12.) "*The Church of the First Three Centuries; or, Notices of the Lives and Opinions of some of the Early Fathers, with Special Reference to the Doctrine of the Trinity, illustrating its late Origin and Gradual Formation.* By ALVAN LAMSON, D. D." 8vo., pp. 352. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co.

The fine octavo before us claims to be a re-examination of the question of the faith of the first three centuries in regard to the nature and relations of the Father, Son, and Spirit. The Christian fathers whose works are critically analyzed and characterized are Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Arius. The extended chapters devoted to these characters are learned and positive, as well as rich in matter and entertaining in style. The erudite critic professedly demonstrates from his review that the doctrine of the Trinity was not extant in the time of these writers. The Apostles' Creed, the Hymnology of the ancient Church, and the artistic representations of the Trinity are then adduced, and the conclusion is drawn, and stated with great positiveness, that the doctrine of the Trinity, as held by modern Orthodoxy, takes form and even existence subsequently to the first three centuries. The challenge is fairly and honorably laid down for the ablest champion upon the other side to furnish a fresh examen of the subject.

- 
- (13.) "*The Homilist: a Series of Sermons for Preachers and Laymen. Original and Selected.* By ERWIN HOUSE, A. M." 12mo., pp. 496. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1860.

This is a book of very choice selections of pulpit literature. There is a marked point, evangelical and searching closeness, and piquant force of style



in the specimens of preaching here presented. As aids for the young preacher, and as religious tracts for spiritual edification, they are among the best extant.

- (14.) "*Notes on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to Philemon, as the Basis of a Revision of the Common English Version, and a Revised Version with Notes.*" 16mo., pp. 90. New York: American Bible Union; Louisville: Bible Revision Association; London: Trübner & Co., No. 60, Paternoster Row. 1860.

This beautiful edition of the single brief Epistle to Philemon, bright with crimson and gilt, is issued for the examination and free criticism of the scholars of our country preparatory to its adoption by the Final Committee of the American Bible Union. It contains, first, a preface, reviewing the history of English Biblical translation; next, an introduction to the epistle; then the Greek text, in a rich black type, exhibiting as fine a specimen of "the swarthy daughters of Cadmus" as often walks abroad. The Greek is furnished with critical notes. Then the new version with notes, succeeded by a copy of the received version. In an appendix we have the letter, original and translated, of Pliny to Sabinianus, being one of the most exquisite specimens of the epistolary left us by classical antiquity, exhibiting all the more clearly, by its striking parallelism, the inferiority of the noblest Paganism to primitive Christianity. The notes and translation are, we understand, by Professor Hackett. Whatever criticisms the volume may meet from our Biblical scholars, we risk nothing in saying that it is in its way a special gem.

- (15.) "*The Biblical Reason Why; a Family Guide to Scripture Reading and a Hand-book for Biblical Students.* By the Author of 'The Reason Why,' 'General Science,' etc. Illustrated with numerous engravings." 12mo., pp. 324. New York: Dick & Fitzgerald.

A successful attempt to popularize Biblical knowledge. The information is in the form of question and answer. The topics are well selected. The engravings are generally, though not always, illustrations of fact and not of fancy. The ordinary reader, using it in connection with the Scripture perusal or independently, will find himself able to follow many parts of the sacred record more intelligently.

## II. *Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.*

- (16.) "*How to Enjoy Life; or, Physical and Mental Hygiene.* By WILLIAM M. CORNELL, M. D." 12mo., pp. 360. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son; New York: Sheldon & Co.; Boston: Crosby, Nichols, Lee, & Co.; Cincinnati: Riekey, Mallory, & Co.; Chicago: Griggs & Co. 1860.

Among the many works on Hygiene this is one of the best. It is written with thorough science, great good sense, and freshness of style. Much good advice is given to clergymen, but we find nothing for them more important in our estimation than the following paragraph:

"Few clergymen there are who cannot call to mind times when they have preached under great oppression. They have felt themselves to be in a torpid

state, more like sleeping than speaking. They have almost gasped for breath. The reason or cause of all this they have not known at the time, but have at length perceived that they have been preaching in a nearly exhausted air-pump. The house had been closed since the last Sabbath. Not a window had been raised, nor a door opened, but for the ingress or egress of the people. Of what air there was the minister had the worst of it, especially if he was compelled to ascend one of those pulpits which seem designed to raise him as far toward

"That heaven to which he points  
And leads the way"

as was at all practicable. The rarified air ascending, he had to take its most deleterious effluvia."

---

### III.—History, Biography, and Topography.

- (17.) "*Forty Years' Familiar Letters of James W. Alexander, D. D.* Constituting, with the Notes, a Memoir of his Life. Edited by the Surviving Correspondent, JOHN HALL, D. D." 2 vols., 12mo., pp. 412, 379. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

A biography so purely epistolary, on so extended a scale, and so complete in its details, was never before published. Perseverance through such a length of time, in so minute a correspondence with a single correspondent, shows both a marked unity of life and an unusual consistency of character. The epistolary series commences with Alexander's entrance into Princeton College, in 1819, and terminates a few days previous to his death, in 1859.

Dr. Alexander was by birth a Virginian, a son of a president of Hampden Sidney College. He filled, in early life, pastorates successively in Virginia and New Jersey, then the editorship of the Presbyterian at Philadelphia, and a professorship at Princeton. Subsequently he was pastor of Duane-street Presbyterian Church in New York, was theological professor at Princeton, and finally pastor of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York. The letters are the most perfectly unstudied effusions of the moment, aiming at no arrangement of topic, and running through a rapid change of disconnected subjects, without the formality of paragraphs. Their style is slightly above the conversational, and furnish opinions, feelings, and free remarks on surrounding events or living characters as they occur to the writer's thoughts. The notes of Dr. Hall are far too few and brief. A series of letters may give a very perfect idea of certain phases of a man's character, but there is a vast amount of truth in regard to every character important enough for a biography in two volumes, which it would never occur to him to relate in a haphazard correspondence. The reader to whom Dr. Alexander is not already well known would ask a completer account of his writings, his style as a preacher, his figure as a public man.

The following paragraph shows that Dr. Alexander was one of the rare few out of our own denomination able to appreciate Richard Watson.

"The simple view in which systems seem to me valuable, are as indexes to the subjects of Scripture. *Turretine* is in theology *instar omnium*; that is, so far forth as Blackstone is in law. I would not have you concur in all such scholastic

distinctions; but the whole ground is traversed, every question mooted, and even where hairs are split the mental energy and local adroitness with which the feat is achieved present one with an exercise of reasoning equal to anything in Chillingworth. I conscientiously believe I should say all this of him if he were a Socinian. That he is not, but rather an ultra Calvinist, I am pleased, for I find in him, among many that are untenable, triumphant arguments for all our doctrines. Making due allowance for the difference of age, Watson the Methodist is the only systematizer within my knowledge who approaches the same eminence; of whom I may use Addison's words: 'He reasons like Paley, and descants like Hall.'"—Vol. i, p. 181.

"Kidder has put out a valuable translation from the Portuguese on Celibacy: see this week's Observer. I have met him twice. *Me judice*, the Methodists are doing more than all of us in evangelizing this Sodom."—Vol. ii, p. 10.

"Some of the Methodists preach delightfully; and when they all sing together, it leaves the orchestral style far behind."—Vol. ii, p. 12.

Here is an important suggestion for preachers:

"Looking back—for I have passed the XL—I lament many things in my preaching; and among these, that I have not from the beginning aimed at the *greatest subjects*. Two things keep us from this: 1. A diffidence about treating them, because they are great; 2. A dislike to topics which seem so familiar. By the great topics I mean, not the outworks of Christianity, but the citadel; the Fall, the Atonement, Faith, Judgment. The same remark applies to the famous parts of Scripture, the Crucifixion, the Good Samaritan, the Ten Virgins, etc. We are in danger, from a neglect of this, of passing our short lives in frittering away at the appendages of the Gospel."—Vol. ii, pp. 24, 25.

"The very violent attempts at visible unity, as in the Liverpool Convention, savor of an unworthy suspicion that there is no Gospel union but in protocols and in platform *accolades*. The unity (*ni fallor*) which the Bible enjoins is no such thing, and is consistent with great diversity. Push a ritualist, and how little he can show for the unity. A Dominican and a Jesuit are far more asunder than Kidder [Methodist] and I in dress, in creed, and in service. Who authorizes them to say that the unity resides in swearing by one and the same pope?"—Vol. ii, p. 46.

"I think I am not censorious nor chagrined, in judging that religion in New York runs very much toward externals. Fine churches, pews, and music, fine sermons, fine 'enterprises,' viewed in the same light as stock-company concerns, fine collections; such are the stimulating ideas. 'Moderatism' is the *terminus ad quem*. So far as my researches go, Presbyterianism has never and nowhere made striking advances, except when the body of preachers and people has been animated with a zeal for truth and saving souls, such as at the very time has been a little too strong, methodistical, pietistical, enthusiastical, in the eyes even of many sound, good sort of brethren. When we substitute for this secular stimulants, wealth, apparatus, ritual, decorum, letters, or oratory, we find that these (at least in the apprehension of the million) exist in greater force among the Episcopalians. Nor do we mend the matter by fighting these last on questions of difference. Our real aggression has always been by warm pushing of our evangelical tenets. Right or wrong, this has become more and more my theory; I would I could show some corresponding practice: *negatively* I think I can."—Vol. ii, p. 74.

The two following furnish an amusing cluster of name puns:

"*Bush* has preached for *Bellows*; his name will consort with the other fuel—*Greenwood, Sparks, Burnap, Furness*, etc., [all Unitarian preachers.]"—Vol. ii, p. 26.

"Old Mr. Scott said in 1849: 'We fare well in our Church; last Sabbath we had *Kittle* and *Potts*; to day *Krebs* (pronounced by him *crabs*) and *Eells*.' Such was literally the fact."—Vol. ii, p. 197.

"If I were ten years younger I would have a building erected to hold two thousand, and would preach to free seats; not that I think the existing plan ought to be abandoned, but because I think we ought to have several, yea, many plans, yea, many sorts of preachers, 'unlearned deacons' and all."—Vol. ii, p. 206.

Some critics have cut up the editor of the *Methodist Quarterly* for speaking irreverently of Dr. Cummings. That said editor is not alone, witness the following touches:

"So many around me are mad with Cumming that I have lately been examining his prophetic volumes, four or five in number. He has a great charm of clear, beautiful, picturesque language; beyond this, he is a cross of — on —; superior to either, but as conceited, as shallow, as uncharitable, and as one-sided. Of real original proof—nothing. As to prophecy, he merely hashes up Elliott. His interspersed pious addresses are good."—Vol. ii, p. 222.

"The religious romance of early Methodism interests me more than Macaulay, and I think John Wesley's English better than Swift's or Cobbett's."—[Ibid.

"Augustine is the only father of whom I read much; and the more I read the more I perceive that if you leave out predestination and justification by faith, his scheme, and that of the Catholic Church of his day, was just that which Pusey would restore. Nothing can be more garbled and misleading than the *centos* given by Milner."—Vol. ii, p. 234.

---

(18) "*The Pioneers, Preachers, and People of the Mississippi Valley.* By WILLIAM HENRY MILBURN, Author of 'The Rifle, Ax, and Saddlebags,' and 'Ten Years of Preacher Life.' 12mo., pp. 465. New York: Derby & Jackson. 1860.

This elegant volume comprises ten lectures, standing in historical order, and giving a comprehensive view of the past and present of our Mississippian west from the era when first De Soto set forth on his romantic tour of discovery. It is divided into natural chronological periods, comprising the primitive age of French dominion, the anterevolutionary British predominance, the western scenes during the Revolution, the progress of events until the failure of Burr's expedition in 1806, and, finally, the period within the recollection of the writer's cotemporaries.

The fascination of the author's style of feeling, thought, and language pervades the pages in its fullest power. The rich, natural, lucid flow of the periods; the varied yet always vivid, and often luxuriant picture; the selection of event and character so easily allowed by the nature of his well-chosen theme, combine to render this one of the author's best volumes, and one of the most readable volumes of the day. Rich as is the author's imaginative power, he never transcends the limits of fact. It is not his purpose to forge a romance of American history, but to unfold the true element of the romantic in history; and no man need affirm, after the publication of this volume, that our country has no heroic age, or even that its heroic age is past.

Milburn possesses a catholicity which for moments may induce you to imagine that he is at heart an indifferentist; but you soon discover your mistake, and learn that he simply has his own method of blending a liberalizing temper with a firm grasp of essential truth. You may fancy for some pages that he

is ready to court a general popularity by sinking his peculiar principles; but you are soon undeceived by his disclosing, in full and frank manifesto, not merely confession of what he is, but aggressive profession. In the high finish of his style of thought and rhetoric you anticipate at times an approaching over delicacy; but never fear; at the proper time you will find that he can call a very "swill-pail" by its right name, and that his genial nature can feel and show the taking side of homeliness.

We could adorn our pages with many a fragment of written eloquence, many a pictorial of rare beauty, many a touch of exquisite sentiment, some trains of lucid and subtle, but not sententious or deep-reaching reflection from Milburn, but the following brave paragraph for Francis Asbury shall suffice:

"Such a man was Bishop Asbury, to my mind one of the most important, if not the most important personage in the ecclesiastical history of this continent. With all respect to Jonathan Edwards, Dr. Dwight, Dr. Channing, all the other eminent and pre-eminent men of New-England—I have read them, and knew some of them—I think that Francis Asbury, that first superintendent and bishop of our Methodist Church, was the most renowned and redoubtable soldier of the cross that ever advanced the standard of the Lord upon this continent. Yet you will not find his name in a single history of the United States that I know of, and it is a burning shame that it is so. He traveled for fifty years, on horseback, from Maine to Georgia, and from Massachusetts to the far West, as population extended; journeying in that time, as was computed, about three hundred thousand miles. He had the care of all the Churches; was preaching instant in season and out of season; was laboring indefatigably with the young men to inspire and stimulate them; winning back the lost and bringing amorphous elements into harmony, in a Church which, when he began with it in 1771, numbered probably not fifty members; and which, when he was an old man—he died in 1816—numbered, white and black, from Maine to California, and from far northwestern Oregon to sunny southern Florida, nearly a million of members. So vast a Church did Francis Asbury build, almost solely by his own profound wisdom, untiring effort, and ceaseless devotion; and he did as much for building school-houses and colleges, erecting churches, establishing sound views of morality, and lofty purity in the forms of life; for gathering and establishing in doctrine and discipline this immense body of Christians, now the most numerous in the country, having more by one-third of stated ministers, and more colleges than any other two denominations in the land. That one who has done this should not have had his name even so much as named in a single school history in the United States, I say is a shame."

---

(19.) "*A Year in Europe.* By the Rev. JOSEPH CROSS, D. D. Edited by THOMAS O. SUMMERS, D. D." 12mo., pp. 519. Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Methodist Publishing House. 1859.

Dr. Cross is an Englishman by birth, a Northerner of our American States by education; a Southerner by the seductions upon a genial temperament of the manners and institutions of the sunny clime. Of the Southern Methodist Episcopal Church, he is a "crack" writer and a "star" preacher. Pure, graceful, eloquent English flows like transparent "writing fluid" from his pen. The Church North should not have lost him; and would not, had his *æsthetic* been a little less keen, or his *ethic* a little more stern.

Dr. Cross is a model traveler, narrator, and picturer. With him you are in gentle sunshine all the way. Not but that plagues and malapropos are not turning up now and then; but they are only frequent enough to show how

dexterously they may be evaded, disregarded, or transformed into aliment for pleasantry.

Our traveler first took England on his way to the continent, and took the continent on his way to Italy. For Italy and England (to which last he subsequently returned) are his two European *native* countries; the former by birth, the latter by his large enthusiastic fancy. How did he enjoy, how does he touch with graphic pencil the queen of the Adriatic, the eternal city, the volcano, the buried cities, the world of ever-varying wonders and memories which unfolds itself in classic and ecclesiastic Italy.

Then, once more in England, Dr. Cross gives us portraits of the great preachers, Raffles, M'Neil, Melvill, Spurgeon, and others. The criticisms are among the best in their class. No writer has given us so distinct a view of the secret of Spurgeon's power. The closing chapters, describing tea-parties in London, from one to five, are entertaining, and not a little suggestive. Chapter the last, in which Dr. C. visits the home of his boyhood, has a power to open the "sympathetic spring of tears."

After describing the difficulties he met in getting a seat in the rush to hear the "finest sermonizer in England," Henry Melvill, he says of the sermon:

"It was a solid mass of thought, squared by the severest logic, and adorned with the noblest rhetoric. It was highly evangelical too; full of the very essence of the Gospel. But a delivery so peculiar, who shall describe? It is wholly unimaginable. The war-steed rushing to the charge; the avalanche thundering down the mountain: the burning ship flying before the tempest, are the best similitudes of his splendid impetuosity and power. His voice is clear but not musical; his enunciation is very distinct and emphatic; his intonations and inflections quite ludicrous to a stranger. Now you have the tone and cadence of rapid, earnest conversation; then the speaker drops into a lower key, husky and guttural, and runs on in a perfect monotone for five minutes or more, till you imagine him quite exhausted for breath; when suddenly he vaults into the lofty sentence which is to conclude the paragraph, and with a mighty 'O!' in the middle, and a spasmodic jerk of the head at the end, he flings out the words in a half scream, which well-nigh electrifies the audience. The Rev. Dr. Ryerson, of Canada, who was present the last Sabbath, assured me that he was much more vehement twenty years ago; and that there is scarcely anything now, in voice or manner, to remind one of the former Melvill. Action, strictly speaking, he has none. He stands as erect and motionless as the Nelson monument, till he comes to the close of an argument, when he slightly elevates his right hand, and gives a nod which threatens the dislocation of his neck. Of slight stature, thin visage, dark complexion, keen black eyes, finely-moulded features, and bushy hair, as white as wool, he is a man of imposing mien, but not half so majestic in the pulpit as M'Neil, nor half so graceful as Cumming. Spurgeon attracts the mob, Melvill draws the intellect of London. The Penny Pulpit, for more than twenty years, has published more of his sermons than of any other living man's, and annually a large volume of them is bound up for the market. His popularity, however, is confined to the pulpit and the manuscript. He makes no platform speeches, nor ever ventures an extemporaneous paragraph.

'Tis true 'tis pity—pity 'tis 'tis true;

but it must not be denied that he is pretty thoroughly imbued with the sacramentarian theology; and in one of the sermons to which I listened, he taught most distinctly and earnestly the doctrine of baptismal regeneration; that whenever the water of baptism is sprinkled by a consecrated hand upon a child, that child is regenerated, and needs but abide in the grace received in order to eternal salvation."



- (20.) "*The History of Herodotus. A new English Version, with Copious Notes and Appendices, illustrating the History and Geography of Herodotus, from the most recent sources of information; and embodying the Chief Results, Historical and Ethnographical, which have been obtained in the Progress of Cuneiform and Hieroglyphical Discovery.* By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A., late Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford. Assisted by Col. Sir HENRY RAWLINSON, K. C. B., and Sir J. G. WILKINSON, F.R.S. In four volumes. Vol. iii. With Maps and Illustrations." 8vo., pp. 463. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1860.

The present volume of this great work embraces the fourth, fifth, and sixth books. To the first book there are appended three dissertations; to the fifth, two, and to the sixth, two, and a valuable note on the derivation and meaning of the proper names of the Medes and Persians. There are thirty-two maps and illustrations.

We can perhaps convey to scholars who have not seen the work a true idea of the value of its contributions to history and ethnology in no better way than to give the contents of the appendices of the fourth book:

"ESSAY I.—*On the Cimmerians of Herodotus and the Migrations of the Cymric Race.*—1. Early importance of the Cimmerians—their geographical extent. 2. Identity of the Cimmerii with the *Cymry*—close resemblance of the two names. 3. Historical confirmation of the identity—connecting link in the Cimbri. 4. Comparative philology silent but not adverse. 5. Migrations of the Cimmerians—westward, and then eastward. Existing Cimbric and Celtic races.

"ESSAY II.—*On the Ethnography of the European Scyths.*—1. Supposed Mongolian origin of the Scyths—grounds of the opinion twofold. 2. Resemblance of physical characteristics, slight. 3. Resemblance of manners and customs, not close. 4. True test, that of language. 5. Possibility of applying it. 6. The application—Etymology of Scythic common terms. 7. Explanation of the names of the Scythian gods. 8. Explanation of some names of men. 9. Explanation of geographical names. 10. Result, that the Scythians of Herodotus were an Indo-European race. 11. Further result, that they were a *distinct* race, not Slaves, nor Celts, nor Teutons; and that they are now extinct.

"ESSAY III.—*On the Geography of Scythia.*—1. Necessity of examining Niebuhr's theory of the Scythia of Herodotus. 2. The theory stated. 3. Its grounds. 4. Considerations which disprove it. 5. Real views of Herodotus. 6. His personal knowledge of the region. 7. His correctness as to leading facts, and mistakes as to minutæ. 8. Possibility of changes since his time. 9. Identification of rivers and places.

- (21.) "*A Voyage down the Amoor, with a Land Journey through Siberia, and incidental Notices of Manchooria, Kamschatka, and Japan.* By PERRY M'DONOUGH COLLINS." 12mo., pp. 390. New York: Appleton & Co.

The position of Mr. Collins in California awakened his meditations to the future commercial and historical importance of the Pacific Ocean, of the empires upon its opposite shores, and the splendid isles, more noted in romance and poetry than known to history, that stud its bosom. The vast continent of resources and of wants that lie in Asia furnishes material for an incalculable commerce waiting for an outlet and inlet yet to be opened. Patient and searching observation enabled him to fix upon the great river Amoor as the means of furnishing the desideratum.

Furnished with credentials from our government, he embarked for Russia

in April, 1856, and, furnished with credentials from the Russian emperor in December of the same year, he started upon a magnificent sleigh-ride from Moscow eastward, across Central Asia, through the cities of Ekaterenburg, Omsk, and Irkutsk, to the sources of this wonderful river Amoor. At its head waters he arrived on Thursday, June 4, 1857, at ten o'clock in the forenoon, about fifteen thousand miles from his starting-point. Of this day and hour was he proud, as of an epoch memorable in the annals not only of the Amoor and of Mr. Collins, but of Asia, of America, and the rest of mankind.

From the heart of Central and Northern Asia the Amoor flows eastward with a magnificent and navigable current into the Pacific Ocean, near the isles of Japan. The project of Mr. Collins is, by agency of an American company, to place a line of steamers upon the river and connect it by railroad with Irkutsk. For this he has obtained the concurrence of the Russian authorities, and his book presents his enterprise to the notice of the world. His vision of the future results is still more extensive. He affirms "that railroads are quite as practicable in Siberia, and from Europe across the Ural and Altai Mountains to the head waters of the Amoor as they are from St. Petersburg to Moscow, or from Moscow to Warsaw." Steam transit, then, from Moscow across the southern margin of Siberia to the Pacific is the really intended ultimatum.

---

(22.) "*The Life of Jacob Gruber.* By W. P. STRICKLAND." 12mo., pp. 384. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1860.

Gruber was one of the class of unique characters whom exciting interests and stirring revolutions bring into publicity and sometimes into history. Such men attract attention from their cotemporaries by the perpetual unexpectedness of their sayings and doings. They awaken the interest of the philosopher by showing into what quaint and curious forms human nature may be moulded. When, as in Gruber's case, the occasion that calls them forth is a religious excitement, a sense of incongruity arises in fastidious and conservative minds; but the very unexpectedness of their procedures, especially when resulting not from forced but from natural originality, produces an awakening, and, on the whole, reforming effect. Beyond all doubt Gruber was an original; perhaps the most natural and inimitable original of our American Methodist history.

Dr. Strickland is a veteran biographer. For no one of his books, perhaps, does the Church owe him more thanks than for the volume before us. His Asbury may possess a more standard value, but for that work the materials were safely and permanently extant; but his securement of the evanescent traces of Gruber was a fair rescue.

The trial of Gruber for the utterance of antislavery sentiment, the characters engaged, and the spirit displayed, furnish a marked passage in the biography. We can scarce imagine ourselves, while reading it, to be tracing a series of events occurring in a land boasting its freedom. The voice of Gruber, though perhaps temporarily silenced, can never die. The doctrines he uttered, whether or not he persisted in their proclamation, are destined to a triumph even upon the ground of his fiery trial.

- (23.) "*Early Methodism within the Bounds of the Old Genesee Conference, from 1788 to 1828, or the first Forty Years of Wesleyan Evangelism in Northern Pennsylvania, Central and Western New York and Canada; containing Sketches of interesting Localities, Exciting Scenes, and Prominent Actors.* By GEORGE PECK, D.D." 12mo., pp. 502. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1860.

Perhaps no man living could have been selected more fitted to furnish a survey of the past events of Methodism within the field here defined than the author of the present volume. The localities, the scenes, the characters, the spirit of the times are to a great degree familiar to his memory. To the Methodists of its own section especially the book will be matter of much personal interest. To the future historian it will furnish material not hitherto gathered from the broad field which our work has overspread. More we might say, but it will probably be better said in a full article of a future number.

- (24.) "*Narrative of the Earl of Elgin's Mission to China and Japan in the years 1857, 1858, 1859.* By LAURENCE OLIPHANT, Private Secretary to Lord Elgin, Author of the '*Russian Shores of the Black Sea.*'" 8vo., pp. 645. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860.

The opening of the barred gates of the Japanese empire, and the initiation of mutual intercourse between her and Christendom, is one of the triumphs of modern civilization and a parent of future triumphs. To the Christian Church, looking over the vast field of the world, her domains seem whitening to the harvest. The volume before us is full of information for the statesmen both of the Church and nation. The volume will derive additional interest from the interchange of national courtesies, as well as the opening of commercial relations, in which our government has so appropriately and honorably taken the lead.

- (25.) "*The American Ecclesiastical Year-book.* Containing, 1. The Present Religious Statistics of the World. 2. A Brief Religious History of all Denominations in all Countries during the past Year. Vol. I. The Religious Statistics and History of the Year 1859. By ALEXANDER J. SCHEM, Professor of Hebrew and Modern Languages in Dickinson College." 12mo., pp. 237. New York: H. Dayton. 1860.

We have already announced this work, and testified to the ability and fitness of Professor Schem for its production. We trust that the work will be found by its purchasers worthy of its author. It will be seen that it claims to be volume first; and as each year will add a new volume, it may be found desirable to commence with the series.

- (26.) "*The Life and Times of Herod the Great, as connected Historically and Prophetically with the Coming of Christ, and Incidental Portraits of noted Personages of the Age.* By WILLIAM M. WILLETT. 12mo., pp. 384. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1860.

This volume is an admirable introduction for the young reader to the New Testament. From a diligent investigation of the complex history of the times.

Mr. Willett not only narrates, but delineates with a considerable pictorial power the scenes and characters that prepared the way for the advent. There should be a map or two added to the volume; some inaccuracies of style need revision, and the book might well take its place in the Sunday-school Libraries.

- 
- (27.) "*The History of France.* By PARKE GODWIN. Vol. I. (Ancient Gaul.)" 8vo., pp. 495. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1860.

Mr. Godwin undertakes the high task of furnishing to the English language what it has not hitherto possessed, a history of France worthy of the subject and worthy of our age. Its research is fundamental, its spirit is philosophical. The abilities of the author will, we think, be found equal to his mission of furnishing a great history of a great people. The present volume is in a great degree archæological. But such is the character of the brilliant race which constitutes its principal figure that the narrations and dissertations are as fascinating as they are instructive.

- 
- (28.) "*History of the Great Reformation in England, Ireland, Scotland, Germany, France, and Italy.* By REV. THOMAS CARTER." 12mo., pp. 372. New York: Carlton & Porter; Boston: J. P. Magee. 1860.

Everybody has heard of Luther and the Reformation, and nearly everybody would like to read the whole story if it were not so very long. Four or five volumes, like those of D'Aubigné, on the subject are too much, amid so many other demands, for one short life. Here, then, is the story in short compass, written by a countryman of D'Aubigné, in much the same free flowing style, with the same evangelic power. It is not, however, a mere abridgment, a D'Aubigné junior. Mr. Carter thinks and speaks for himself. His volume ought to be, and we trust will be popular.

- 
- (29.) "*A Missionary among Cannibals; or, The Life of JOHN HUNT, who was eminently successful in converting the People of Fiji from Cannibalism to Christianity.* By GEORGE STRINGER ROWE." 16mo., pp. 286. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1860.

Dr. Wise has here adopted, and adapted to American wants, an English publication of great interest and rare power. Who has not heard of the wonders of grace in Fiji? Who has not felt a glow of heart over the triumphs of the blessed Gospel in subduing the fierce cannibals, and transforming them to followers of the meek lamb of God? And the Church reaps a reflex blessing from this field in the lives and inspiring examples of the Christian heroes under whose labors the work is accomplished. Such missionaries, by the history of their labors, create their own successors. Let the Church place their memorials in the hands of her children, and she shall never want a man to stand before the Lord in readiness for the work.

IV.—*Politics, Law, and General Morals.*

- (30.) "*Echoes of Harper's Ferry.* By JAMES REDPATH." 12mo., pp. 513. Boston: Thayer & Eldridge. 1860.

The present volume is a collection of Essays, Sermons, Addresses, and Poems, eulogistic of the heroism of John Brown of Ossawotomie. There is much brave and fiery eloquence in its pages, bearing no little resemblance in its brilliant abandonment to the hero and the exploit under celebration. Thoreau, Wendell Phillips, Emerson, Theodore Tilton, and Victor Hugo are the orators; Cheever, Gilbert Haven, Fales H. Newhall, and Edwin M. Wheelock are the preachers; Whittier and Lydia Maria Child are among the poets. Seldom has any book gone forth from any press, in any age, more rife with burning life.

We do not think that John Brown showed us the way to abolish slavery. We do not think that enterprises like his would generally hasten the approach of emancipation day. We do not think that the crop of heroes of his grain are on the whole an available product of cultivation. We say this without any undervaluation of the intrinsic antique nobleness of the man, or any under estimate of the terrible personal wrongs he had suffered. But the occurrence of his enterprise deeply embittered a controversy which we trust tends to a peaceful termination. The encouragement of outbreaks against established laws upon private and individual impulse is dangerous to all social order. Yet it is possible that on the whole the results have rather advanced than retarded the antislavery sentiment. The momentary check is like that produced by the fall of a feeble water jet flung by an engine upon an extensive conflagration, arresting but a moment, and then feeding the flame with the very element that should extinguish. The antislavery revolution gathers new power from every momentary obstacle, and rushes like a planet in its orbital path to the resistless consummation of its divine destiny.

- 
- (31.) "*Introduction to the Study of International Law.* Designed as an aid in Teaching and in Historical Studies. By THEODORE D. WOOLSEY, President of Yale College." 12mo., pp. 486. Boston and Cambridge: Munroe & Co. 1860.

The volume before us is the result of President Woolsey's professional labors. It is shaped for a place which is filled by no work hitherto published, namely, collegiate instruction. The works of Vattel and Wheaton are too voluminous, and the chapters by Kent are embodied in a work of great extent upon a more general subject. The publication of this book is very likely to make the branch of study more customary in our universities. The name of Mr. Woolsey is a guarantee for its standard character.

## V. Educational.

- (32.) "*A Treatise on Elementary and Higher Algebra*. By THEODORE STRONG, LL.D., Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy in Rutgers's College, New Brunswick, N. J., Member of the American Philosophical Society, and of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences." 8vo., pp. 551. New York: Pratt, Oakley, & Co. 1859.

Two objects appear to have been prominent in the author's mind in the preparation of this work, to attain either of which a high order of mathematical ability was essential. One of these was to give a full view of the present condition of the science of Algebra. Of course, a work written with this object in view cannot be adapted to the wants of as large a class of students as one which is devoted exclusively to the elements of the science, and is not likely to be very generally adopted as a text-book. But we think that those who wish to obtain a better knowledge of the subject than can be obtained from any of the treatises in general use, will find Dr. Strong's book better adapted to their wants than any other American work. Every topic which we expect to find in a treatise on true algebra is discussed with as much fullness as can be desired; and every subject, from the most elementary to the most abstruse, is placed in as clear a light as the nature of the subject would allow.

But this work will be very valuable even to those who are familiar with the science. Dr. Strong has been recognized for many years as one of the ablest mathematicians in our country. He has devoted a large portion of his life to scientific investigations, and his principal object in preparing this treatise was to give the results of his labors, some of which constitute very important additions to the science. The most valuable of these contributions are found in the chapters on equations. Some of the most difficult problems pertaining to equations, whose solution has been obtained hitherto only by the aid of the higher mathematics, are brought within the domain of pure algebra. For example, we notice a purely algebraic and rigorous proof of the well-known theorem, that the number of the roots of an equation is equal to the degree of the equation, which has been assumed or only partially demonstrated in other works on algebra, because a complete demonstration was supposed to require a knowledge of the calculus. In like manner, the solutions of binomial equations of the irreducible cases of cubic and biquadratic equations are effected without recourse to the principles of trigonometry. A new method is given for the development of the roots of numerical equations, which is much more simple than any of the older methods, and gives the *imaginary* as well as the *real* roots to any degree of accuracy. To those who are not familiar with the extensive application of the theory of equations to other departments of scientific research, such contributions as these will doubtless appear to be of little value. But when it is remembered that most of the difficulties which arrest the progress of the mathematician in the higher fields of speculation, or in those departments of astronomy and physics to which algebraic reasoning is applicable, arise from his imperfect acquaintance with



the theory of equations, we think that it will be conceded that he does not unduly appreciate any additions to his knowledge of the subject.

We have mentioned some of the most important of the author's additions to the science, but there is scarcely a chapter of the work which is not enriched by the results of his own studies. Our limits will permit only a simple reference to some of the less important, such as the appendix to multiplication and division; a new method of solving quadratic equations; a new and complete demonstration of the binomial theorem; the fundamental theorem of the differential calculus. We are especially pleased with the introduction of the last named subject. A judicious use of the doctrine of infinitesimals would remove the difficulty of many propositions which are found in even the elementary works.

We regret to notice a serious defect in the arrangement of the matter. The equations, both important and unimportant, are printed with the text. This gives a heavy appearance to the page, and makes any reference to the important equations very difficult. All of the formulæ of which subsequent use is made should occupy separate lines.

V.

---

(33.) "*The Elementary Spelling-Book*, being an improvement on the American Spelling-Book. By NOAH WEBSTER, LL.D." 12mo., pp. 168. New York: Appleton & Co.

Profound is our respect for the original "Webster's Spelling-Book." Its image and its lessons are among our earliest recollections; dim and semi-mythical shadows in the primitive antiquity of our own little microcosmic history. Innocent but dubious were the days when, in our hopeful developments, we mounted from *ampersand* to *bag*, from *bag* to *baker*, and from *baker* to *crucifix*. Equal achievements, premonitory of the struggle for advancement in life's farther stages, we have perhaps never since accomplished. Our notions about the being, person, reality, corporeity of Noah Webster were very crude. He stood to us in very much the same atmosphere, half way between fact and fiction, with Samson and Santa Claus. It was indeed rumored that he lived in New Haven. But what or where was New Haven? In name it might be confused with *heaven*. In position it might be "on night's Plutonian shore." When, at the rounded age of thirty, an age at which the supposed realities of things are claimed to be more clearly ascertained, we saw—ocularly—with corporeal vision—the veritable and venerable figure of Noah Webster, *ipsissimum*; it strengthened our faith in the historical reality of Adam, and Melchisedek, and the other Noah. And truly venerability more beautiful, age more youthful, seldom or never have we seen than Noah Webster's. The blooming cheek, the clear eye, the fresh, morning-like spirit at near threescore and ten, were a refreshment and a lesson to behold.

And now we would like to see a genuine "Webster's Spelling-Book" in its own primitive purity, just as we would like to see the greensward of our childhood's sports, and the faces familiar to our young vision. But what "Spelling-book" have we here, with its "improvements" and other brags? A figment, a novelty, an imposture! This "Mr. Wm. G. Webster" we do not

know; and as for "Emily W. Ellsworth and Julia W. Goodrich," the very display of their names smacks of the degenerate days of "women's rights" and abolitionism. And the book itself is a mass of confusion. Here is *baker*, but where is *bag*? Where is *crucifix*? Such upturning of fundamentals unsettles all certainty, and tends to Atheism. We are resolved to be uncompromisingly conservative. We would thank things to stay as they are. Otherwise Darwin's theory will prove absolutely true: everything will grow out of itself into something else, and nobody will long know either himself or anything else, or be able to guess into what shape or substance he may finally be transmuted.

- 
- (34.) "*Class-Book of Botany*. Being Outlines of the Structure, Physiology, and Classification of Plants. With a Flora of all parts of the United States and Canada. By ALPHONSO WOOD, A. M." 8vo., pp. 174. New York: A. S. Barnes & Burr. 1860.

Mr. Wood's class-book has been before the public some fifteen years, and this edition aims to embrace the latest fruits of research. It is a model of comprehensive conciseness. Complete clearness with such frugality of words is seldom attained. Its reputation is fully sustained by its merits.

- 
- (35.) "*Manual of Geology*. Designed for the Use of Academies and Colleges. By EBENEZER EMMONS, Professor in Williams College. Illustrated with numerous Engravings. Second Edition." 8vo., pp. 297. New York: Barnes & Burr. 1860.

Professor Emmons's work is admirably adapted to its purposes as a manual of instruction. It draws its illustration from facts of American Geology. Its form is well suited for the full exhibition of objects by cuts, which are furnished in copious abundance. This edition embraces the latest phases of the science.

---

## VI.—Periodicals.

- (36.) "*The American Life Assurance Magazine and Journal of Actuaries*. Edited by G. E. CURRIE. Vol. I." New York: Gilbert E. Currie. 1860.

This magazine is published quarterly at the office designated. The volume before us comprises three numbers of the Magazine, and the proceedings of the "First American Life Underwriters' Convention," held in New York, May, 1859.

The contents of the volume consists of valuable statistics and estimates in connection with the practical operations of life assurance. It contains information enough to acquaint any one sufficiently with this subject. The general principles of the system and the details of operation, with convincing arguments in favor of it, are clearly stated. The contributors evidence an earnest and enthusiastic interest in the subject, which the reader can scarcely fail to participate in.

Life assurance is one of the growing interests in our country, and, we think, deservedly so. Information should be widely circulated in regard to it. For this purpose we commend the "American Life Assurance Magazine."

A second convention of American Life Underwriters has been recently held in New York, May, 1860. From its proceedings we learn that the funds now held in trust by the life assurance companies in this country amount to *twenty-two millions of dollars*, the sums insured are about *one hundred and eighty millions*, and the number of lives assured near *one hundred and sixty thousand*. Over *two millions* of dollars are paid out every year by the falling in of claims, mostly to widows and orphans. The necessity has been felt by American companies for an American table of mortality. This is now in the hands of an able committee for construction, and we learn that the number of lives, their data for the work, is greater than that from which the best English tables were made. It is ascertained that middle-life in America is not subject to as high a rate of mortality as in England, while both ends of life with us are subject to a greater rate.

This system originated in pure benevolence, and benevolence too for widows and clergymen. In England, in 1698, the first society was organized for the benefit of widows of clergymen. In our country it had the same origin. In 1769 "The Protestant Episcopal Corporation for the Benefit of Widows and Children of Clergymen in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania" was chartered. And yet we believe no class has shared less in the benefits of assurance than clergymen. Several articles have lately appeared in the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, New York, calling the attention of Churches to this subject, proposing that they enter upon some arrangement to secure life policies for their pastors. One of these articles suggested an outline of a plan by which the advantages of the system of assurance might be secured to the ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, generally, at but little cost, or inconvenience to the Church at large. Some of the Annual Conferences have agitated the subject, and we hope it will receive the attention and action it deserves.

- 
- (37.) "*The University Quarterly*. Conducted by an Association of Collegiate and Professional Students in the United States and Europe. April, 1860." 8vo., pp. 429. Printed for the Association. Thomas H. Pease, New Haven, Conn., General Agent.

The purpose of this stately quarterly is to stand as an organ of our American Colleges, a medium of intercourse and unity, serving to give them in some degree the collective character of a national university. It is a happy conception, and should be realized without failure. It is characterized by a marked catholicity of plan and spirit. It starts indeed from Yale. The present number embodies contributions and statements of collegiate history from New Haven to Beloit, from venerable Columbia to youthful Troy. Every college may associate in the enterprise. We regret to see that as yet Troy alone of our own colleges appears in its pages. Middletown, Dickinson, and the whole corps will, we trust, co-operate.

- (38.) "*Annuaire des Deux Mondes Histoire Generale des divers Etats. Histoire Politique—Relations Internationales et Diplomatic; Administration, Commerce et Finances. Presse Periodique et Litterature. 1858-1859.*" 8vo., pp. 1044. Paris: Bureau de la Revue des Deux Mondes; New York: Balliere.

This is a year-book of general and secular history for both hemispheres. Such a work affords a very convenient resort for reference. Nearly two hundred pages are devoted to America, North and South.

---

### VII.—Juvenile.

"*Little Songs for Little People. With numerous Illustrations.*" 16mo, pp. 256. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1860.

"*Little Things for Little Folks. By Mrs. MARY JANE PHILLIPS. Two Illustrations.*" 18mo., pp. 133. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1860.

"*The Young Gold Seeker, and other Authentic Sketches. A Book for Youth. By Mrs. MARY JANE PHILLIPS. Two Illustrations.*" 18mo., pp. 132. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1860.

"*Arthur and his Mother; or, The Story of a Child that belonged to the Church.\* A Book for Christian Children. Five Illustrations.*" 18mo., pp. 106. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1860.

"*Margaret Maxham. A Book for Young Ladies. By MARIANNA H. BLISS, Author of Little Tiger Lily. Three Illustrations.*" 18mo., pp. 144. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1860.

"*Sweet Corabelle, and other Authentic Sketches. A Book for Youth. By Mrs. MARY JANE PHILLIPS. Two Illustrations.*" 18mo., pp. 164. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1860.

"*The Emigrants, an Allegory; or, Christianity versus the World. By Rev. WESLEY COCHRAN, A. M.*" 16mo., pp. 194. New York: Printed for the Author, 200 Mulberry-street.

"*Happy Mike; or, How Sam Jones became a Good Boy: and The Little Gardener. By CATHARINE BELL. Two Illustrations.*" 18mo., pp. 114. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1860.

"*Clara, the Motherless Young Housekeeper; or, The Life of Faith. By UNA LOCKE. Three Illustrations.*" 18mo., pp. 122. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1860.

"*Juna Atherton's Year at School. A Story for Young Ladies. By LOUISA ELLEN ——. Three Illustrations.*" 18mo., pp. 198. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1860.

"*Pleasant Talks with the Little Folks. By ROBIN RANGER. Ten Illustrations.*" 18mo., pp. 154. New York: Carlton & Porter.

"*Little Mabel and her Sunlit Home. By a Lady. Four Illustrations.*" 18mo., pp. 164. New York: Carlton & Porter.